



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 158

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, MARCH 20, 2012

No. 46

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. TIPTON).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
March 20, 2012.

I hereby appoint the Honorable SCOTT R. TIPTON to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 17, 2012, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes each, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

CRACKDOWN ON CUBAN DISSIDENTS AND POPE'S VISIT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, in the last year we have witnessed dramatic changes in the Middle East and north Africa. There was vast media coverage detailing the brutality of oppressors like Assad in Syria. Yet very little has been said about the escalation of violence against Cuba's internal opposition, a peaceful group that is being attacked by Castro tyrants and

their agents of terror, as we can see in these photos in this poster right next to me, and they're operating just 90 miles from U.S. shores.

But there is an opportunity to correct this wrong, to join forces and shed light on the systematic abuses against freedom-loving Cubans, and to call on Pope Benedict XVI as he prepares to visit the island gulag to publicly support the aspirations of the enslaved Cuban people to exercise their God-given rights.

The Cuban dictatorship has ramped up its use of short-term detentions in order to intimidate and silence the voices of these brave Cubans; and you see here the Ladies in White, and I will explain who they are. They're standing up against tyranny and oppression.

The Castro regime has continued its assault on fundamental freedoms, including the freedom of religion and the freedom of speech. The Cuban people are reminded daily that no dissent is ever allowed as they live under constant threat and surveillance by Cuban state security forces. Regime sympathizers and security forces have actually barred opposition leaders from leaving their homes and have violently attacked other peaceful, pro-democracy protesters on the streets.

Just 48 hours ago, the Castro regime detained about 70 members of the peaceful Ladies in White movement, including 18 women who were arrested in Havana on their way to mass. Berta Soler, an important leader in Ladies in White, was detained during the crackdown.

The Ladies in White, as we can see here, they're a peaceful group, founded by wives, mothers, and daughters of political prisoners who have suffered in Castro's gulags. These ladies are advocates of freedom; and by silently marching as they do through the streets, they convey a powerful message of peace and a voice for all the oppressed. The Ladies in White have ex-

pressed their interest in meeting with the Pope during his visit next week but have not been able to confirm that meeting.

A few days ago, 13 members of Cuba's opposition staged a peaceful sit-in at a Catholic church in Havana to call attention to their request for Pope Benedict XVI to meet with pro-democracy advocates during his visit to the island. Reports indicate that Castro agents forcibly removed these human rights defenders from the church, detained them, and subjected them to severe interrogation.

It is my hope, Mr. Speaker, that Pope Benedict will meet with these brave dissidents—as you can see in this new poster, they were dragged through the streets—and shine a light on the struggles of the Cuban people who are living under the rule of the oppressive Castro brothers.

I urge the Catholic church to express its support and solidarity with the internal peaceful opposition and hear the voices of the dissidents who are yearning for freedom. As you can see here, they're being attacked; they're dragged through the streets in Cuba.

The passionate struggle of the internal opposition will not be deterred by the abuses that are occurring daily at the hands of the Castro regime. These recent crackdowns by the regime illustrate its fear, its paranoia, its concern that the Cuban people are no longer afraid of the regime and are demanding a democratic change on the island.

The citizens of Cuba are denied basic human rights by the Castro regime, including the freedom of speech, freedom of assembly, and due process of law. These fundamental freedoms should not be reserved for the citizens of some countries while denied to those in other nations.

I urge free nations, responsible nations, to condemn the recent action by the Castro brothers, as shown here, to speak out against the atrocities that

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H1393

are committed daily in Cuba, and to reaffirm unconditional support for the Cuban people who seek to break free from the shackles of the Castro tyranny.

THE PRICE OF WAR IN AFGHANISTAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT) for 5 minutes.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask the American people to consider the price of the Afghan war, not only its unsustainable financial toll, but also the psychological cost to those on the front lines as well as those here at home, because this war, fought on the ground by a tiny percentage of Americans and largely ignored by the greater majority of us, nonetheless, has had powerful effects on each one of us.

In the past 3 months, there have been several high-profile incidents in Afghanistan that have forced us to reflect on the mental state of the men and women who put their lives on the line every day in Afghanistan.

In January, four soldiers in combat gear urinated on three bloodied corpses. In February, American soldiers burned copies of the Koran, which triggered 6 days of riots across Afghanistan. And this month, a soldier went on a murderous rampage in Kandahar province, killing 16 Afghans, including nine children. These events have shocked us, but they remain remote to most of us.

I want to talk today about what this war has done to our national psyche, that is, our sense of connectedness to one another and our sense of mutual obligation to this country.

The war in Afghanistan is being fought primarily by a small group from the Army and Marine Corps who serve multiple tours because we do not have adequate replacements for them. This has allowed most of us to disengage ourselves from the terror, the suffering and despair endured by those who are sent to war. Retired General Robert Scales wrote in the Washington Post last week: "We are fighting too many wars with too few soldiers." He's right.

More than 100,000 of our soldiers have been deployed three or more times since 9/11. Many of them are overused, exhausted, demoralized, and unprepared to come home to a country that has little personal investment in the war and does not fully understand its objectives. Is it fair or reasonable to send these courageous citizens to war four, five, and six times?

I was a doctor who treated combat soldiers returning from Vietnam, and I know that no one escapes multiple tours of combat duty without trauma. There have been almost 100,000 new cases of PTSD among our servicemembers since 9/11. The military suicide rate in some months has been higher than the casualty rate. We are wrong

to subject such a small group—fewer than one-half of 1 percent of all Americans—to such a disproportionate share of the consequences of war.

I felt this way in 2007 when I supported fellow veteran Charlie Rangel's bill, declaring it an obligation of every American citizen between the ages of 18 and 42 to perform a 2-year period of national service either as a member of the national forces or in civilian capacity that promotes national defense in times of war. Several weeks ago, my constituent, Sergeant William Stacey, became the 399th resident from Washington State to be killed since the war on terror began following 9/11. In his letter, which soldiers write in case they die, Sergeant Stacey wrote:

My death did not change the world, but there is a greater meaning to it. There will be a child who will live because men left the security they enjoyed in their home country to come to his.

□ 1010

If more Americans sacrificed their time and energy toward our country's ideals, perhaps Sergeant Stacey's dream of a more peaceful Afghanistan could become a reality.

As the overwhelming majority of the Nation stands by while 23-year olds die in a distant war zone, our national psyche has been frayed, and our shared identity is diminished. We have become immune, immune to the traumas of war, and we have lost our sense of common purpose.

In the Vietnam War, when everybody served, you had no immunity because everybody knew somebody, but now it's not that way. We must face the true cost of war on not only our soldiers, but ourselves and our ideals.

USING USA ENERGY TO MEET OUR NEEDS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, when GenOn announced it would close its coal-fired power plant in Elrama, in my district in southwestern Pennsylvania, my community didn't just lose the 50 remaining jobs; it also lost a vital component to economic growth: affordable energy.

We should be cleaning up, not shutting down these power plants, but new regulations aimed squarely at coal, oil, and natural gas are making it harder for families to get by, for manufacturers to prosper, and making it more difficult for our country to become energy independent.

The Elrama plant is one of 57 nationwide slated to close because of a multitude of costly and unworkable EPA rules set to take effect over the next 5 years. Already utilities are preparing to retire almost 10 percent of coal power in the country. That's 25 megawatts of energy that supports 18.8 million homes.

That lost capacity, which is five times greater than what the EPA predicted it would be, is why the North American Electric Reliability Corporation is warning of blackouts and service disruptions.

The EPA's new coal regulations will cost the economy \$184 billion and 1.4 million jobs in mining, transportation, manufacturing, and power generation. Of course, the expense will be passed along to consumers. Families in my State could see about \$400 more a year in their electric bills.

And it begs the question, is the President trying to make good on his promise to bankrupt utilities that use coal?

These new costs would come at a time when higher oil prices already mean families are paying \$2,400 more per year for gasoline than they were just 3 years ago. And if gasoline approaches \$5 a gallon, the average family will pay over \$3,000 more per year. That's a couple of months worth of groceries, or college loans, or payments on a new car.

Unfortunately, instead of increasing oil supplies to bring down prices, domestic oil production on Federal lands has fallen 13 percent in the last year. The President said we have only 2 percent of the world's proven reserves, conveniently overlooking the technically recoverable oil that is under lock and key in the gulf and the shale oil States. We have more oil reserves—800 billion barrels—than Saudi Arabia.

By the way, that means for a family that makes less than \$10,000 a year, they'll be spending 81 percent of their income on energy. For a family that makes between \$10,000 and \$30,000 a year, they'll be spending 24 percent of their income on energy.

And for every dollar of gasoline, 76 cents is tied up in crude oil. To bring down the price of gas, we don't need higher taxes on oil companies or penalties on speculators. What we need to do is send signals to the world that the United States is serious about using North American energy. We can start with building the Keystone pipeline.

Now, many of my colleagues argue that we can count on plentiful natural gas to replace the demand for coal and oil. But while deposits are being unlocked from the Marcellus shale and the Utica shales with new fracturing technologies, natural gas is also threatened with costly overregulation. Eight different Federal agencies are there to stop it. The EPA, the Departments of the Interior, Energy, Transportation, and Agriculture, the Centers for Disease Control, the Army Corps of Engineers, and the Securities and Exchange Commission are all working on new regulatory burdens.

One national energy organization predicts an EPA natural gas regulation for well sites specifically written to combat "global warming" will cut shale gas drilling by between 31 and 52 percent. That means higher energy bills to heat our homes.

With our know-how and resources in coal, natural gas and nuclear, America

can still become an energy-independent Nation. That's why I introduced an all-of-the-above energy plan that wouldn't raise taxes, borrow from China, or buy from OPEC. The Infrastructure Jobs and Energy Independence Act, or H.R. 1861, expands safe offshore oil and gas exploration, creates over a million new jobs annually, and launches \$8 trillion in economic output. It dedicates a portion of its up to \$3.7 trillion in new Federal oil and gas revenues for investments in rebuilding our aging infrastructure, power generation, and grid modernization, and helps put us on a path to energy independence.

And rather than shutting down coal-fired power plants, my bill invests in the kind of cutting-edge technology being developed at the National Energy Technology Laboratory to clean up coal.

So we can either continue to build the wealth of OPEC countries that use our money to fund terrorism, nuclear weapons, and unfriendly policies, or build jobs here at home with energy independence. We can let OPEC pick the winners and losers, or make the USA the winners again. I choose the USA.

We have the energy resources to unleash prosperity, but first and only if the Federal Government gets out of the way. The Federal Government should be a partner in prosperity, not build bureaucracies and barriers to stop our energy independence and hurt the American family.

ENDING OUR DEPENDENCE ON FOREIGN OIL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. QUIGLEY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, everyone in Washington is trying to arrive at the same destination. We seek to end our dependence on foreign oil, a dependence that endangers our environment, hurts our economy, and weakens our national security.

Importantly, there is a right way to get there. That includes cracking down on oil speculators, ending Big Oil handouts, investing in public transportation and green energy, and increasing corporate average fuel economy standards.

There's also a wrong way: ransacking our coastlines for oil. But you don't have to take my word for it. You can take a page from the history books on this one. For 8 years under the previous administration, the number of oil leases on public lands almost tripled. It didn't help gas prices, which doubled in 2008, and it didn't make us energy independent.

Why not?

The simple fact is the U.S. has less than 3 percent of the world's oil reserves. No matter how much we drill in the U.S., that number is not expected to change. We will never have enough oil to satisfy domestic demand for energy. After all, we currently use 25 percent of the world's oil, and we will

never have enough to sufficiently impact prices on the world market.

The U.S. Energy Information Administration has said as much, noting that increases in U.S. domestic production could be neutralized by a corresponding decrease in production among international oil producers, namely, OPEC.

What's really to blame for high gas prices? Is it a lack of domestic production of oil?

Ken Green, a resident scholar with the conservative American Enterprise Institute, doesn't think so. Ken said:

The world price is the world price. Even if we were producing 100 percent of our oil, we probably couldn't produce enough to affect the world price of oil.

Well then, who's really to blame for high gas prices? Is it this administration?

Michael Canes, the former chief economist for the oil industry's American Petroleum Institute, says otherwise:

It's not credible to blame the Obama administration's drilling policies for today's high prices.

What's really to blame for high gas prices is excessive speculation by entities that have no consumption interest in the underlying commodities and that profit by doing nothing more than forecasting price trends.

Our primary focus should be on countering the growing impact of energy speculation rather than simply promoting the oil industry's priorities of increasing domestic drilling.

Experts, including oil industry officials and investment firms, estimate that excessive oil speculation could be inflating prices by up to 30 percent. But increasing domestic drilling would impact prices by only about 1 percent, and that would happen only after a decade or more.

So then where do we go from here?

We learn from those who are reaping the economic benefits of transitioning to development within a booming green industry, countries like India and China.

Right now, in this Chamber, we neglect to consider a host of incentives for international and domestic investment in renewable energy production. Just last week a measure failed to pass the Senate that would have extended production tax credits for wind, solar, and the like.

□ 1020

At a time when we're rolling back, governments in Southeast Asia are refining targets for renewable energy expansion, extending subsidies, and dangling tax breaks. This does not a domestic competitive advantage make, and, frankly, we're better than that.

Gas prices are still below the peak they reached under the previous administration in 2008; crude oil is at \$107 a barrel today compared to \$145 a barrel back then. But listening to the news, you'd have a hard time believing these cold, hard facts.

Even if we were to drill a hole everywhere in the country we know to have

oil and drain out every drop of proved reserves, we would have just enough to last us 1,094 days, just 3 years. That trickle won't ease gas prices.

Raising average fuel efficiency for cars to 60 miles per gallon by 2025 would reduce gasoline consumption by 2.8 million barrels per day by 2030. A combined investment in more efficient cars and trucks, cleaner fuels, and more transportation options for Americans could cut our oil imports in half by 2030. The administration is currently developing the next phase of standards covering vehicles sold through the model year 2025, a strong and laudable goal.

We can and must end our dependence on foreign oil, a dependence that endangers our environment, hurts our economy, and weakens our national security. We can and must do better.

TAYLOR TOWNSEND

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. HARPER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. HARPER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge the work that Taylor Townsend, a 19-year-old Mississippian and the reigning Miss Mississippi College, is doing to eradicate human trafficking.

Taylor is passionate about the worldwide problem of human trafficking, which has lured millions of people into forced labor. Taylor Townsend is lending her support for the Blue Heart Campaign to bring awareness to human trafficking and the exploitation of people, especially children and teenagers.

In addition to her work in building awareness worldwide with the Blue Heart Campaign, Taylor Townsend has been offering her support in the great State of Mississippi. She has promoted the passage of two bills pending before the Mississippi Legislature and is involved in educational efforts bringing awareness to Mississippians.

Mr. Speaker, young people like Taylor Townsend who volunteer their time to help make our country and world a better place should be applauded. They should give us great hope for the future.

MARCH 20, 2012—SECOND ANNIVERSARY OF THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I stand here in the same spot where I was about 2 years ago, March 23, 2010, to celebrate the passage of one of the most important acts that this body has ever passed: the Affordable Care Act.

On March 23, we will celebrate the 2-year anniversary of that landmark decision. Of course, next week the Supreme Court will hear arguments on whether the individual mandate is permissible or not. Let us hope that the Supreme Court will act according to the law.

The Affordable Care Act will change the landscape of our Nation's health care delivery system for the better. I hosted a telephone town hall last night with my constituents on the Affordable Care Act and was joined by the Deputy Secretary of Health and Human Services, Bill Corr, to answer questions from folks in my district about how it will affect them.

We listened to comments and stories about people who have been in the doughnut hole, seniors, that cost them a lot of money. We told them about the fact some of them knew that once they go into the doughnut hole—after they spend about \$2,500 or \$2,700 and up to about \$5,000 you go into that hole—that the moneys will be paid for, for generic drugs, with a 50 percent discount because of the Affordable Care Act. That is extremely important for citizens and others with high drug prices.

Children will be able to stay on their parents' insurance, if they choose to, up to the age of 26, which didn't happen before; and that's so important for young people and for parents to know the security that their children will be insured if they have a health care crisis.

Doctors will be able to see seniors for preventative care without cost. That's happening right now for those on Medicare and will happen for everybody in 2014 when the law goes into effect for all—mammograms, colonoscopies, shots for children, vaccinations, et cetera.

The insurance companies will no longer be able to have lifetime limits on how much people can use their insurance in case of illness.

There will be a consumer-friendly exchange where you can shop for prices for insurance and compare insurance policies to get what's best for you.

You can't arbitrarily be dropped from coverage by your insurance company simply because you get sick, and pre-existing conditions will no longer be a basis to deny somebody insurance. Already today, for children up to the age of 19, preexisting conditions cannot stop you from getting insurance.

I had polio when I was a child. I would not like to think of any child that gets an illness such as that today, whether it be diabetes or cancer or any other illness, to be denied insurance because of a preexisting condition. That, because of the Affordable Care Act, will not occur in the future in this country.

Insurance companies have taken people off of insurance because they've used too much in a year or too much in a lifetime, and that's going to stop.

The idea of getting preventative care, which Medicare provides now and all will have in the future, will lead to lower health care costs because, if you catch illnesses early, it's much more cost efficient to treat them, and lives will be saved as well.

Insurance companies are required to spend at least 80 percent of their monies on treating patients, not on executive pay, advertising, administrative

costs, or other such costs to the consumer; and if they go over that in any way whatsoever, the consumer will get a rebate. Insurance companies must now publish justifications for any premium increases they are seeking of more than 10 percent on the Internet, and outside experts will evaluate whether those increases are justified. The consumer will be protected.

The doughnut hole ending, which I talked about earlier, has helped 3.6 million seniors receive discounts of \$2.1 billion, each senior saving an average of \$604.

The preventative care services I mentioned under Medicare, 32.5 million seniors have already received one or more of those preventative services; and youngsters have received them as well because they get preventative care in their vaccinations without having to have a copay, which might stop their parent from taking them to the doctor to get those vaccinations which can prevent illnesses later.

Seniors are now receiving free annual wellness visits under Medicare, and 2.3 million seniors in traditional Medicare have already taken advantage of the new annual wellness visit.

Young adults stay on their insurance, as I mentioned; 2.5 million additional young people have gained insurance over the last year.

Paul Krugman wrote in yesterday's New York Times that what is called by the Republican Party ObamaCare—which really, if you think about it, is a good thing, Obama cares, but it's not intended to be by them as, really, Obama-RomneyCare, because the plan we adopted is based upon what Mitt Romney did in Massachusetts to make sure that the people of Massachusetts bought insurance and the burden was shared in an appropriate way.

Thank you, Mitt Romney. Thank you, President Obama. Thank you, United States American Congress.

SENSELESS DEATHS BECAUSE OF RACE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WILSON) for 5 minutes.

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am tired of burying young black boys. I am tired of watching them suffer at the hands of those who fear them and despise them. I'm tired of comforting mothers, fathers, grandparents, sisters, and brothers after such unnecessary, heinous crimes of violence.

In Florida, almost 3 years ago, as I served in the Florida Senate, a young black boy, Martin Lee Anderson, was beaten to death at a Florida boot camp. It was all captured on a State of Florida Corrections video and shown all over the world. Martin Lee Anderson was beaten and tortured until his lifeless body couldn't take any more, and then Martin Lee Anderson was dead at the hands of several boot camp guards—a young boy who wanted to be somebody, a young boy who was trying to turn his life around.

After they beat him to death on international TV as the world watched, over and over again, not one guard was sent to prison. Not one was even reprimanded. In fact, after we closed down every boot camp in Florida, many of the accused received promotions.

□ 1030

Well, guess what? In Florida, we have another Martin, Trayvon Martin. Trayvon Martin was shot to death by a renegade wannabe policeman neighborhood watchman.

Trayvon Martin lived in Miami, Florida, in District 17, my congressional district.

Trayvon, a 140-pound young black boy, 17 years old, was just trying to live and reach 18. In spite of that, the accused killer, George Zimmerman, has not been charged and is using the term of self-defense.

The 911 audiotapes tell it all. They tell the story of the last moments of Trayvon Martin's life, just as the videotapes told so visibly the story of Martin Lee Anderson's last moments. Trayvon was running for his life. He was screaming for help, fighting for his life, and then he was murdered, shot dead.

Today I applaud the Florida Department of Law Enforcement, the FBI, and the Federal Department of Justice for their intervention. I encourage the citizens of Florida and the citizens from around the world to continue to fight for justice for Trayvon Martin. Justice must be served. No more racial profiling. I'm tired of fighting when the evidence is so clear, so transparent.

Twenty years ago while serving as a school board member, I founded the 5000 Role Models of Excellence Project. It is a million-dollar nationally recognized and honored foundation that specifically addresses the trials and tribulations of young black boys and sends them to college. It impacts almost 20,000 young men throughout Florida.

In spite of that, we still have to march and demonstrate and write letters and protest and fight and have prayer vigils and sue and sit in just to be heard. No more. No more, Florida. No more, America. No more hiding your criminal racial profiling by using self-defense to get away with murder.

Stand up for Trayvon Martin. Stand up for justice. Stand up for our children. I'm tired, tired, tired of burying young black boys.

THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT IS MAKING A DIFFERENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Affordable Care Act is styled such for a reason. Let us look back to 2009, at the time we embarked upon passing the Affordable Care Act. At that time in 2009, we were spending \$2.5 trillion per year on health care—\$2.5 trillion. That is a lot of money, and it

is very difficult to understand \$2.5 trillion. Well, \$2.5 trillion is \$79,000 per second. That's what we were spending on health care, \$79,000 per second. I'll be quite candid with you: these numbers are so huge that sometimes I do confuse them myself. That's \$79,000 per second.

We were spending 17.6 percent of GDP on health care. It was projected that by 2018, we would be spending \$4.4 trillion per year on health care. That would be \$139,000 per second. As I said, big numbers. It's hard to always get them correct because they are so huge and they can be confusing. That's \$139,000 per second.

We had 45,000 persons per year dying because they didn't have proper health care. We had 21 million people who were working full time and did not have insurance. That is 21 million people. In my State of Texas, 6 million people were uninsured. Twenty percent of the State's children were uninsured. In Harris County in my State of Texas, 1.1 million people were uninsured.

It was time for this Congress to act, and act we did. By passing the Affordable Care Act, we have reduced the cost of health care over the long term. It doesn't happen immediately, because the rising cost, as I've explained to you, was exponentially huge. It was almost unimaginable. To bring it down doesn't mean it comes down instantly, but over the next 20 years we will save a trillion dollars.

Here's what we've done. Aside from lowering the cost, which is important, we also impact lives. Preventive care is there. We also do away with pre-existing conditions. For those who did not know, pregnancy is a preexisting condition. We also make sure that women are not discriminated against. Women won't be charged more simply because they are females, because they are women. We equalize health care as it relates to the genders. We close the doughnut hole as it relates to senior citizens. I might also add that in '09, we were spending about \$100 billion a year on uninsured persons, much of that in emergency rooms where persons had to go to the emergency room to get the care that they did not have by virtue of not having insurance. They were getting their primary care in emergency rooms. They were also getting their pharmaceuticals through emergency rooms. It was a time to act, and act we did. We passed the Affordable Care Act.

I will close with this. We live in the richest country in the world. One out of every 100 persons is a millionaire. In this country, if you are an enemy combatant and we should capture you and wound you in the process, we will give you aid and comfort. In this country, if you are a bank robber and you're robbing the bank and on the way out we should harm you, when we capture you, we will give you aid and comfort. In this country, if you're on death row and scheduled to meet your Maker next week and you get sick this week, we

give you aid and comfort this week and we send you to meet your Maker next week. In this country, if we can give aid and comfort to the enemy combatant, if we can give aid and comfort to the criminal who robs the bank, if we can give aid and comfort to the person on death row, surely we can give aid and comfort to hardworking Americans who do not earn enough to afford insurance.

The Affordable Care Act does this. It does not require people who cannot afford insurance to buy it, but it does say that every person who can should buy insurance.

The Affordable Care Act is making a difference in the lives of people. Children can stay on their parents' policies until they're 26 years of age. This was a good piece of legislation. I supported it then and I still support it now. The Affordable Care Act is affordable, and that is why we passed it.

REAUTHORIZE THE WORKFORCE INVESTMENT ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. TIERNEY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support legislation that I, along with Congressman GEORGE MILLER of California and RUBÉN HINOJOSA of Texas, are introducing later today to reauthorize the Workforce Investment Act.

The Workforce Investment Act, or WIA as it is commonly known, is the primary Federal law governing how employment and training services are provided to adults, youth, and dislocated workers. It was enacted in 1998 when unemployment was below 5 percent and before many of today's high growth industries even existed. It is long past time for WIA to be modernized and retooled to address our country's current challenges.

The bill I'm introducing today does just that. This bill increases access to training and improves the delivery of employment services. It strengthens the law's accountability standards to better evidence program effectiveness and provide assurances that our taxpayer dollars are being well spent.

My bill ensures that the kind of innovative work that's being done by the North Shore Workforce Investment Board in my district and elsewhere across the country can be replicated and taken to scale, and it expands the role of community colleges in job training.

□ 1040

This is the kind of commonsense legislation on which this Congress should be acting. We need to make sure we provide the training and education so that Americans have the skills to fulfill the jobs of today and tomorrow. Too many businesses have job vacancies because they can't find qualified candidates. Working together to help

workers and those looking to hire them should not be a partisan issue. We need to find those qualified candidates and put them to work.

Modernizing and strengthening WIA will help both workers and employers, and it will ensure that our country can remain competitive in this global economy. I urge my colleagues' support for it.

PROTECTING AMERICA'S YOUTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning on a number of issues that I think are enormously important, and I am delighted to join initially my colleague from Texas to again emphasize and truthfully tell the story about the Affordable Care Act that is now 2 years old. But as a founder and the cochair of the Congressional Children's Caucus, and because our children are our presents and our tomorrows, I think it's important to ask the question: Do we want healthy children? And should health care be a question of wealth and status? Or should it be open to all of our beautiful and precious children and youth?

The Affordable Care Act allows our young college students to remain on their parents' health insurance until the age of 26. The Affordable Care Act allows a baby that has a proclivity to asthma as a preexisting condition to be able to be covered by insurance. It provides an opportunity for extensive research into some of the unsolved childhood diseases, such as pediatric cancer. And, of course, it provides greater access to health care by expanding what we call community health clinics, something that I have been a proponent of since coming to Congress and throughout the Bush administration, when I asked President Bush directly about the number of community health clinics not only in the Nation but in my State of Texas, where we have the highest number of uninsured persons.

So I don't know why our Republican Presidential candidates and many think that the rising pathway to victory is to condemn an opportunity for our children. I find that curious, at best. And I would applaud and celebrate President Obama and his administration, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, Secretary Sebelius, and all of those who are contributing to the implementing of this legislation. I can tell you, in Texas today, as I stand, women are being denied access to health care. Thank God for the Affordable Care Act for its constitutional or its Federal premise of providing access to health care for all Americans. At least we have something that we can use to question the denial of access to health care to women in the State of Texas.

I indicated that I chair the Congressional Children's Caucus, so I rise

today to applaud the Justice Department decision to investigate the death, the murder, of Mr. Trayvon Martin in Sanford, Florida. A youngster, the child of two loving parents, minding his own business, wearing the attire of youthful people, hoodies, sneakers. I understand that he had his earphones in his ear and may have been bopping along to a little music.

I support Neighborhood Watch. I come from local government. Neighbors should watch out for each other but not a neighborhood vigilante. If the 911 call said to that individual, Mr. Zimmerman, "Don't follow him," then get in your car and sit quiet. The police are on the way.

Every one of us, as parents—I have a son—this is not an issue that should strike us as color. It should be anyone that has a teenager, bopping along with a hoody on and sneakers and earphones in his ear, just going to get candy, to be able to sit in front of the all-star game, and he winds up with a gunshot to the chest that kills him dead in his tracks.

Thank you Justice Department for recognizing that the harsh law in the State of Florida that says that you can stand your ground and defend yourself, this man should have retreated. He should have never been out there after that boy. That boy was not found coming out of a window, going through a door. He was on a sidewalk. And it is an outrage. Thank you to President Obama's Justice Department for recognizing that his civil rights are now in question of having been violated. And the Federal law preempts Florida's law, which is the harshest law in this Nation. Every parent should think at least that if their child is just being a child, just being a teenager, a youngster who liked to babysit and play football, that he still had life ahead of him.

I also want to say that I support moving the "R" status from the bullying bill. I held a major hearing in my district. Bullying is an epidemic. And I have introduced major legislation, H.R. 83, and I am encouraging the Judiciary Committee to pass this legislation dealing with bullying. It is an epidemic. We can reauthorize the block grant to give money for best practices to help parents, to help schools, to help children learn about bullying. I believe in our children. I want this Congress to believe in our children, and this Nation to believe in our children.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 44 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro

tempore (Mr. GINGREY of Georgia) at noon.

PRAYER

Reverend Andrew Walton, Capitol Hill Presbyterian Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

On a day when leaders of Irish and American nations meet to celebrate common heritage and mutual dreams, may our spirits be united in the one spirit.

May this day bring the memory of shared anguish and struggle to stir appreciation for times when comfort and peace are our companions.

May this day awaken within us wonder and imagination that inspire us beyond the confines of routine and ritual.

May the contemplations, conversations, and decisions of the day be undergirded by wise thoughts, kind words, and humane actions.

May we find God-given goodness within ourselves and within those whom we encounter that we may defend and nurture the worth and dignity of every human being.

May we find success on our journey.

Go n-eiri an bothar leat, meaning, "May the road rise with us."

May the wind be always at our back.

May the sun shine warm upon our face,

The rains fall soft upon our fields,

And until we meet again,

May God hold us in the hollow of His hand.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under clause 5 (d) of rule XX, the Chair announces to the House that, in light of the resignation of the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE), the whole number of the House is 432.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests

for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

CAPTAIN THOMAS "BILL" DILLION—HOUSTON FIRE FIGHTER

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as the bagpipes played in the background, the black cloth of sacrifice was draped over the badges of Houston first responders yesterday.

Senior Captain Thomas "Bill" Dillion of the Houston Fire Department was rushing into a house fire on March 14 when he apparently died of a heart attack. Captain Dillion was 49 years of age and had spent 23 years with the Houston Fire Department. He had three children.

With somber respect, hundreds of Texas firefighters, police officers, emergency medical technicians, and citizens attended his funeral. Mr. Speaker, 300 firefighters from other towns in Texas volunteered their time to fill in at Houston Fire Department stations so Houston firefighters could attend the funeral.

Firefighters are a family of dedicated, loyal public servants. Captain Dillion and other firefighters spend their lives rescuing people they do not know and protecting property they have never seen from fire. Most of us flee danger; firefighters rush to the smell of smoke and the heat of danger.

Bill's crew at Station 69 spoke yesterday about him, saying he was a devout Christian, had a contagious happy mood, loved to fish and, of course, liked country music.

Captain Dillion and his fellow firefighters are a remarkable breed, a rare breed, the American breed. We thank them, one and all.

And that's just the way it is.

AMERICAN WOMEN'S HEALTH

(Ms. HAHN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the second anniversary of the Affordable Care Act, legislation that makes quality health care more affordable for everyone. March is also Women's History Month, so I would like to talk about how this act affects women's health.

Instead of just imposing government mandates on health care for women, I believe the Affordable Care Act empowers women and their families because the Affordable Care Act bans insurance companies from requiring women to obtain authorization before getting OB/GYN care. The Affordable Care Act keeps insurance companies from denying coverage for conditions such as breast or cervical cancer, pregnancy, having had a C-section, or being the victim of domestic violence; and it ends the practice of gender rating, so women will no longer be charged higher rates for simply being a woman.

The Affordable Care Act does all of this while preserving Americans' right to choose their own doctor and the health coverage that they want. Women's health, Americans' health is better because of the Affordable Care Act.

ALLOWING ELECTION YEAR POLITICS TO DICTATE POLICY IS NO WAY TO GOVERN

(Mr. BOUSTANY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, since this administration took office, the price of gasoline has more than doubled. In January of 2009, the national average price for a gallon of gasoline was \$1.79. Today, that same gallon of gasoline will set you back \$3.84. Yet this administration continues to let election-year politics dictate policy.

Since 2010, I have led the charge at fighting President Obama's assault on offshore drilling. The moratorium, a knee-jerk reaction by Washington liberals, harmed many local oil and gas producers on the Gulf Coast. According to a recent study conducted by the Louisiana State University, the moratorium resulted in the loss of 8,000 Gulf State jobs and \$487 million in lost wages. And to make matters worse, the administration continues to push higher taxes on American independent energy producers, leading to higher costs and higher unemployment rates.

The past 3 years were marred with poor decisions relating to domestic energy production, with consequences falling directly on south Louisiana families. Now is the time to promote sensible energy policies that put Americans back to work while fully utilizing the resources we have right here at home.

THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT'S IMPACT ON WOMEN

(Ms. FUDGE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, the National Women's Law Center recently reported that 90 percent of the best selling health plans charge women more than men for the same coverage. In addition, insurers have classified millions of women as having pre-existing conditions because of a previous cesarean section or having been pregnant, even for being a victim of domestic violence.

For decades, women have unfairly been charged excessive costs for their health care. Well, that changes now. Because of the Affordable Care Act, the discriminatory practice known as "gender rating," or charging women more than men for care, will be prohibited starting in 2014; and women in private plans can obtain free lifesaving procedures, such as mammograms and colonoscopies.

The Affordable Care Act bans insurance companies from imposing lifetime

limits on care, so Americans will not go bankrupt simply because they are trying to be healthy.

And in 2014, because of health care reform, women cannot be denied access because of a preexisting condition.

There is no better time than today to stand up and demand quality, accessible health care for women.

THE PRESIDENT'S POLICIES BRING HIGHER PRICES AT THE PUMP

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, over the past month, the price of gas per gallon has increased by 31 cents, with an average cost of \$3.83 per gallon. This weekend the President said that his administration could not do much to provide relief at the pump, but, actually, earlier he promised to increase energy costs, which destroys jobs. The President also claims to support an all-of-the-above energy plan; however, due to his decision to reject the Keystone pipeline, it is clear these claims are not being fulfilled.

The President's solution to help with rising energy costs is to delay smog regulations that will mandate that more sulfur be stripped from gasoline. The delay of this policy will not lower prices but simply keep them from increasing due to more government regulation.

I urge the President to work with House Republicans and begin enacting policies which will help Americans feel relief at the pump.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

DISCRIMINATORY INSURANCE PRACTICES

(Mr. COURTNEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, this week the National Women's Law Center issued a report, an online survey of insurance brokers across the country; and what they found is something that every woman who owns a small business or tries to buy a policy on the individual market knows, which is that 90 percent of the best selling insurance plans charge women more than men simply because of the fact that they are women. This is a fact which is not denied by any of the major insurers—Blue Cross, WellPoint, Humana—which were all interviewed in a story in The New York Times a few days ago on this issue. This is not a debating point; this is a fact.

In addition to higher costs, many insurance companies in some jurisdictions around this country deny women coverage entirely because of conditions which are characteristic of women, which is breast or cervical cancer, pregnancy, having a C-section, or even

being a victim of domestic violence. As I said earlier, the Affordable Care Act will abolish all of these barbaric discriminatory practices starting in 2014.

We are going to hear a lot of hooting and hollering this week about repealing ObamaCare, but those people who say that should look women in the eye in this country and tell them what you are going to do to end these discriminatory practices. The fact of the matter is they have no answer.

It is time to stand up for this act.

□ 1210

REPEAL THE IPAB

(Mr. HARRIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, as a physician, you know that buried very deep in the President's 2,000-page health care bill was the Independent Payment Advisory Board, or IPAB, an unelected, unaccountable 15-member rationing board appointed by the President for the sole purpose of cutting Medicare.

Who will the 15 members of the board be? Well, the law actually forbids them from being active health care providers. It only allows 7 members of the board to even have a health care provider background. In short, a majority of the board will be composed of people who have no experience in actually caring for patients.

Patients across the country, especially those in rural areas like my district, are already struggling to find physicians who will accept new Medicare patients. The IPAB will only make this worse. If Medicare beneficiaries are lucky enough to find a physician who will see them, the IPAB will place a government-rationing bureaucrat between them and their physicians. That government bureaucrat has no place in the physician-patient relationship in America.

We need to repeal the IPAB now.

COMPENSATION FOR BETHLEHEM STEEL EMPLOYEES

(Mr. HIGGINS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, the Bethlehem Steel plant in Lackawanna, New York, was once the center of western New York's industrial sector, employing thousands of people. Tragically, these workers were unknowingly exposed to residual toxic uranium dust and high levels of radiation, leaving many suffering from cancer and other health problems. Thanks to the efforts of the employees' families, Congress established a program to compensate former Bethlehem Steel employees for their illnesses. However, this process is a difficult one to navigate.

I am proud to have worked with the individual families and help countless of them receive the compensation they are owed. But, Mr. Speaker, there's

still more to be done. There are families who deserve to be compensated for their suffering. And that's why I, along with New York Senators CHUCK SCHUMER and KIRSTEN GILLIBRAND, are calling on the National Institute of Occupational Safety and Health to expand the eligibility period.

Mr. Speaker, western New Yorkers have long been recognized as some of the most dedicated in this country. I will not rest until those who worked so hard for Bethlehem Steel are compensated for the undeserved suffering.

FIXING MEDICARE

(Mr. GINGREY of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, you've heard on our side of the aisle this morning a number of Members talk about saving Medicare and protecting our precious seniors. What we're wanting to save them from is the most egregious aspect of ObamaCare, and that's called the IPAB law, which is the 15-member bureaucrat agency that's going to actually come between a doctor and his or her patient and interfere with that sacrosanct doctor-patient relationship and make decisions to cut and slash their Medicare opportunity to see their doctors.

This is not the way to fix Medicare, Mr. Speaker. We know how to fix Medicare, and we will talk about that in our budget this year as we did last year, but we must strike down this egregious section of this 2,700-page bill. And we will do that this week.

WOMEN'S HEALTH CARE

(Ms. CASTOR of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Let's get to the facts on women's health care under the Affordable Care Act, which is 2 years old this week.

First, good news: The Affordable Care Act outlaws discrimination based on gender in copayments and premiums for the same coverage. Women have generally been charged more for health insurance. A recent report shows that more than 90 percent of the best-selling health plans still charge women more than men for the same coverage. The Affordable Care Act ends that discrimination.

Second: Women can no longer be denied coverage by an HMO or health insurance company because they have a preexisting condition like breast cancer that's in remission, because they had a C-section when they delivered their child, or even because they had injuries from domestic violence.

Third: Women no longer have to jump through the bureaucratic hoop of obtaining permission to see their OB/GYN.

Fourth: Because prevention works and saves money, women in new health

insurance plans will automatically be covered for screenings, mammograms, colonoscopies, and birth control.

Finally, health insurance companies can no longer cancel your policy if you get sick.

These are important consumer protections for women across America, for our mothers, for our daughters, and for our families.

ELIMINATING IPAB

(Mr. DESJARLAIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DESJARLAIS. Mr. Speaker, because the President cannot stand by his record of failed policies and broken promises, he has resorted to the policies of envy and division—all in the name of "fairness." However, is it "fair" that, to pay for his health care bill, President Obama cut \$500 billion from Medicare, thereby threatening seniors and their access to health care?

As a doctor for over 20 years, I know how important Medicare is to our seniors. That's why I'm proud to join House Republicans this week in introducing a bill to eliminate the new Medicare rationing board created in ObamaCare.

While President Obama thinks 15 unelected Washington bureaucrats should decide the value of medical services, my fellow physicians and I believe that power should remain between the Nation's doctors and their patients. Fifteen unelected bureaucrats. That's one crowded exam room.

Let us pass this bill and get rid of this health care law that we didn't ask for, we can't afford, and we just plain don't want.

EQUAL ACCESS TO HEALTH CARE

(Mrs. DAVIS of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues in speaking up about women's health. As we approach the anniversary of the passage of the Affordable Care Act, I want to remind all of us about some of the challenges that women have faced before health reform was signed into law.

Before health reform was signed into law, insurance companies could deny coverage to women due to so-called preexisting conditions like cancer or even simply having been pregnant. Insurance companies could force women to pay more for their coverage simply because of their gender. And now, thanks to the Affordable Care Act, women will be able to see their OB/GYN without a referral. You've heard that repeatedly today because that's critical and important to women. Women will have access to critical preventive services like birth control with no out-of-pocket costs. And that ultimately saves health care expenses.

Already, hundreds of men and women from all across San Diego have shared with me how important affordable access to contraception is for them and for their families. They can't afford to have it stripped away by this Congress.

I urge my colleagues to build on these reforms to ensure that all women have equal access to health care.

□ 1220

COMMENDING OBAMA'S HEALTHCARE REFORM PRESIDENT LANDMARK

(Mr. FALCOMA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FALCOMA. Mr. Speaker, in the 2 years since President Obama signed the Affordable Care Act into law, millions of Americans have already experienced firsthand its important benefits and the economic security it provides. Because of President Obama's bold reforms, Medicare is now stronger for seniors, and women can now get lifesaving mammograms at no extra cost. Children won't lose their coverage just because they were born with preconditions like asthma.

Altogether, families across the Nation are seeing how health reform is saving lives and saving money. For example, 86 million Americans have received free preventive health care, and 180 million are now protected from some of the worst health insurance abuses. An additional 2.5 million young adults now have health insurance, and 47 million Americans now benefit from a stronger Medicare program. Now prescription drug discounts have saved 3.6 million Medicare recipients an average of \$600.

Mr. Speaker, President Obama's landmark health care reforms are already helping millions of Americans save lives and live healthier lives. I commend President Obama for making the tough decisions that have given more Americans access to an affordable quality health care program.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, we lead busy lives here, and I don't want to blame my colleagues for being forgetful, nor do I want to accuse anyone of just not caring. But I do have to remind the House that before the health care law, insurance companies were free to discriminate against women, and they did so with reckless abandon. Women were charged 50 percent more than men for the same insurance coverage, and pregnancy could be considered a preexisting condition.

Reform ends this discrimination, but, unfortunately, many in Congress and people on the campaign trail have forgotten the past, and they seem to be

determined to repeal it. Reform put women in control of their health, and shame on those who put insurance companies back in charge.

HONORING THE CLOONEY FAMILY

(Mr. AL GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to give a great expression of gratitude to the Clooney family. Mr. George Clooney and his father, Nick, were among the many who were arrested on Friday, March 16, protesting over at the Sudanese Embassy. I am saluting them, and am grateful to them because not only of what they did that day but of what Mr. Clooney did when he went into Sudan, at some considerable risk I might add, to secure evidence of what was taking place there and what is taking place.

Those who would like to see some of the evidence can go to www.enoughproject.org. You can actually see the video.

I believe what he and those others who were arrested have done merits having a flag flown over the Capitol. We will fly a flag over the Capitol in honor of those who participated in the protest movement.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on the motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Any record vote on the postponed question will be taken later today.

EXCESS FEDERAL BUILDING AND PROPERTY DISPOSAL ACT OF 2012

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 665) to establish a pilot program for the expedited disposal of Federal real property, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 665

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Excess Federal Building and Property Disposal Act of 2012”.

SEC. 2. FEDERAL REAL PROPERTY DISPOSAL PILOT PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 5 of subtitle I of title 40, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subchapter:

“SUBCHAPTER VII—EXPEDITED DISPOSAL OF REAL PROPERTY

“§ 621. Federal real property disposal pilot program

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator of General Services (in this subchapter referred

to as the ‘Administrator’), in consultation with the Director of the Office of Management and Budget (in this subchapter referred to as the ‘Director’), shall conduct a pilot program to be known as the ‘Federal Real Property Disposal Pilot Program’, under which the Administrator, in consultation with the Director, shall determine which 15 Federal Government real properties that are excess or surplus and have the highest fair market value and the greatest potential to sell and shall dispose of such properties in accordance with this subchapter and through an expedited disposal of real property.

“(b) DISPOSAL.—During the five-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of the Excess Federal Building and Property Disposal Act of 2012, the Administrator, in consultation with the Director, shall dispose of real property under the Federal Real Property Disposal Pilot Program through a public auction.

“(c) ADDING PROPERTIES TO THE PILOT PROGRAM.—Not later than 15 days after a property is disposed of under subsection (b), the Administrator, in consultation with the Director, shall designate an additional property, in accordance with subsection (a), to be disposed of under the Federal Real Property Disposal Pilot Program.

“(d) EXCEPTIONS.—The Administrator shall not include for purposes of the Federal Real Property Pilot Program any of the following types of property:

“(1) A parcel of real property, building, or other structure located on such real property that is to be closed or realigned under the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (10 U.S.C. 2687 note).

“(2) Properties that are excluded for reasons of national security by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

“(3) Indian and Native Eskimo properties including—

“(A) any property within the limits of any Indian reservation to which the United States owns title; and

“(B) any property title which is held in trust by the United States for the benefit of any Indian tribe or individual or held by an Indian tribe or individual subject to restriction by the United States against alienation.

“(4) Properties operated and maintained by the Tennessee Valley Authority pursuant to the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933 (16 U.S.C. 831 et seq.).

“(5) Postal properties owned by the United States Postal Service.

“(6) Properties used in connection with river, harbor, flood control, reclamation, or power projects.

“(7) Properties that the Administrator has determined are suitable for assignment to the Secretary of the Interior for transfer to a State, a political subdivision or instrumentality of a State, or a municipality for use as a public park or recreation area under section 550(e) of this title. In making such determination, the Administrator may consider the appraised value of the property and the highest and best use.

“(8) Properties used, as of the date of the enactment of this subchapter, in connection with Federal programs for recreational and conservation purposes, including research for such programs.

“(e) GAO REPORT.—Not later than 24 months after the date of the enactment of this subchapter, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress and make publicly available a study of the effectiveness of the Federal Real Property Pilot Program.

“(f) TERMINATION.—The Federal Real Property Disposal Pilot Program shall terminate on the date that is five years after the date of the enactment of the Excess Federal Building and Property Disposal Act of 2012.

“§ 622. Selection of real properties

“The head of each executive agency shall recommend properties to the Director for disposal under the Federal Real Property Pilot Program. The Director, in consultation with the Administrator, shall then select properties for disposal under the pilot program and notify the recommending executive agency accordingly.

“§ 623. Expedited disposal requirements

“(a) EXPEDITED DISPOSAL OF REAL PROPERTY DEFINED.—For purposes of this subchapter, an ‘expedited disposal of real property’ is the sale of real property for cash that is conducted pursuant to the requirements of section 545(a) of this title.

“(b) FAIR MARKET VALUE REQUIREMENT.—Real property sold under the Federal Real Property Pilot Program may not be sold at less than the fair market value as determined by the Administrator, in consultation with the Director. Costs associated with disposal may not exceed the fair market value of the property unless the Director approves incurring such costs.

“(c) MONETARY PROCEEDS REQUIREMENT.—Real property shall be sold under the Federal Real Property Pilot Program only if the property will generate monetary proceeds to the Federal Government, as provided in subsection (b). A disposal of real property under the Federal Real Property Pilot Program may not include any exchange, trade, transfer, acquisition of like-kind property, or other non-cash transaction as part of the disposal.

“(d) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subchapter shall be construed as terminating or in any way limiting authorities that are otherwise available to agencies under other provisions of law to dispose of Federal real property, except as provided in subsection (e).

“(e) EXEMPTION FROM CERTAIN REQUIREMENTS.—Any expedited disposal of a real property conducted under this subchapter shall not be subject to—

“(1) subchapter IV of this chapter;

“(2) sections 550 and 553 of this title;

“(3) section 501 of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11411);

“(4) any other provision of law authorizing the no-cost conveyance of real property owned by the Federal Government; or

“(5) any congressional notification requirement other than that in section 545 of this title.

“§ 624. Special rules for deposit and use of proceeds from expedited disposals

“The proceeds from an expedited disposal of real property under this subchapter shall be deposited into the General Fund of the Treasury. Two percent of such proceeds is authorized to be appropriated until expended to fund the grant program under section 625.

“§ 625. Homeless assistance grants

“(a) GRANT AUTHORITY.—To the extent amounts are made available pursuant to section 624 for use under this section, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall make grants to eligible private nonprofit organizations under subsection (b) to purchase property suitable for use to assist the homeless as provided in subsection (c).

“(b) ELIGIBLE GRANTEEES.—To be eligible to receive a grant under subsection (a), a private nonprofit organization shall be a representative of the homeless, as such term is defined in section 501(i)(4) of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11411(i)(4)).

“(c) USE OF PROPERTIES FOR HOUSING OR SHELTER FOR THE HOMELESS.—

“(1) ELIGIBLE USES.—A nonprofit organization that receives a grant under subsection (a) shall use the amounts received under

such grant only to acquire or rehabilitate real property for use to provide permanent housing (as such term is defined in section 401 of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11360)), transitional housing (as such term is defined in such section 401), or temporary shelter, for persons who are homeless.

“(2) TERM OF USE.—The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development may not make a grant under subsection (a) to a private nonprofit organization unless the organization provides the Secretary with such assurances as the Secretary determines necessary to ensure that any property acquired or rehabilitated using the amounts received under such grant is used only as provided in paragraph (1) of this subsection for a period of not fewer than 15 years.

“(d) PREFERENCE.—In awarding grants under subsection (a), the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall give preference for such grants to private nonprofit organizations that operate within areas in which Federal real property is being sold under the Federal Real Property Disposal Pilot Program under this subchapter.

“(e) NONPROFIT ORGANIZATION.—For purposes of this section, the following definitions shall apply:

“(1) HOMELESS.—The term ‘homeless’ has the meaning given such term in section 103 of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11302(a)), except that subsection (c) of such section shall not apply for purposes of this section.

“(2) PRIVATE NONPROFIT ORGANIZATION.—The term ‘private nonprofit organization’ has the meaning given such term in section 401 of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11360).

“(f) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development may issue any regulations necessary to carry out this section.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 5 of subtitle I of title 40, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 611 the following:

“SUBCHAPTER VII—EXPEDITED DISPOSAL OF REAL PROPERTY

- “621. Federal real property disposal pilot program.
- “622. Selection of real properties.
- “623. Expedited disposal requirements.
- “624. Special rules for deposit and use of proceeds from expedited disposals.
- “625. Homeless assistance grants.”.

SEC. 3. DUTIES OF THE GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION AND EXECUTIVE AGENCIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 524 of title 40, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“§ 524. Duties of the General Services Administration and executive agencies

“(a) DUTIES OF THE GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION.—

“(1) GUIDANCE.—Not later than 6 months after the date of the enactment of this section, and when necessary thereafter, the Administrator of General Services shall issue guidance for the development and implementation of executive agency real property plans. Such guidance shall include recommendations on—

- “(A) how to identify excess properties;
- “(B) how to evaluate the costs and benefits associated with disposing of real property;
- “(C) how to prioritize disposal decisions based on agency missions and anticipated future need for holdings; and
- “(D) how best to dispose of those properties identified as excess to meet the needs of the agency.

“(2) ASSISTANCE.—The Administrator shall assist executive agencies in the identification and disposal of excess real property.

“(b) DUTIES OF EXECUTIVE AGENCIES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Each executive agency shall—

“(A) maintain adequate inventory controls and accountability systems for property under its control;

“(B) continuously survey property under its control to identify excess property;

“(C) promptly report excess property to the Administrator;

“(D) perform the care and handling of excess property; and

“(E) transfer or dispose of excess property as promptly as possible in accordance with authority delegated and regulations prescribed by the Administrator.

“(2) SPECIFIC REQUIREMENTS WITH RESPECT TO REAL PROPERTY.—With respect to real property, each executive agency shall—

“(A) develop and implement a real property plan in order to identify properties to declare as excess using the guidance issued under subsection (a)(1);

“(B) identify and categorize all real property owned, leased, or otherwise managed by the agency;

“(C) establish adequate goals and incentives to reduce excess real property in such agency’s inventory; and

“(D) when appropriate, use the authorities in section 572(a)(2)(B) of this title in order to identify and prepare real property to be reported as excess.

“(3) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS.—Each executive agency, as far as practicable, shall—

“(A) reassign property to another activity within the agency when the property is no longer required for the purposes of the appropriation used to make the purchase;

“(B) transfer excess property under its control to other Federal agencies and to organizations specified in section 321(c)(2) of this title; and

“(C) obtain excess properties from other Federal agencies to meet mission needs before acquiring non-Federal property.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The item relating to section 524 in the table of sections at the beginning of chapter 5 of such title is amended to read as follows:

“524. Duties of the General Services Administration and executive agencies.”.

(c) GSA REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than three years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator of General Services shall submit a report to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate on the implementation of section 524, as amended by subsection (a), and each of the following:

(A) The efforts of each executive agency to reduce such agency’s real property assets, based on data submitted from such agency.

(B) For each excess and surplus real property facility/installation disposed of, an indication of—

- (i) the date and method of disposal;
- (ii) the proceeds obtained from the disposition of such property;
- (iii) the amount of time required to fully dispose of excess and surplus real property under the custody and control of all executive agencies; and
- (iv) the cost to dispose of surplus and excess real property under the custody and control of all executive agencies.

(2) DEFINITIONS.—The terms “excess property”, “executive agency”, and “surplus property” have the meanings given those terms in section 102 of title 40, United States Code.

SEC. 4. ENHANCED AUTHORITIES WITH REGARD TO PREPARING PROPERTIES TO BE REPORTED AS EXCESS.

Section 572(a)(2) of title 40, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraphs (B) and (C) as subparagraphs (C) and (D), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following new subparagraph:

“(B) ADDITIONAL AUTHORITY.—(i) From the fund described in paragraph (1), subject to clause (iv) of this subparagraph, the Administrator may obligate an amount to pay the direct and indirect costs related to identifying and preparing properties to be reported excess by another agency.

“(ii) The General Services Administration shall be reimbursed from the proceeds of the sale of such properties for such costs.

“(iii) Net proceeds shall be dispersed pursuant to section 571 of this title.

“(iv) The authority under clause (i) to obligate funds to prepare properties to be reported excess does not include the authority to convey such properties by use, sale, lease, exchange, or otherwise, including through leaseback arrangements or service agreements.

“(v) Nothing in this subparagraph is intended to affect subparagraph (D).”.

SEC. 5. ENHANCED AUTHORITIES WITH REGARD TO REVERTED REAL PROPERTY.

(a) AUTHORITY TO PAY EXPENSES RELATED TO REVERTED REAL PROPERTY.—Section 572(a)(2)(A) of title 40, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(iv) The direct and indirect costs associated with the reversion, custody, and disposal of reverted real property.”.

(b) REQUIREMENTS RELATED TO SALES OF REVERTED PROPERTY UNDER SECTION 550.—Section 550(b)(1) of title 40, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting “(A)” after “(1) IN GENERAL.—”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following: “If the official, in consultation with the Administrator, recommends reversion of the property, the Administrator shall take control of such property, and, subject to subparagraph (B), sell it at or above appraised fair market value for cash and not by lease, exchange, leaseback arrangements, or service agreements.

“(B) Prior to sale, the Administrator shall make such property available to State and local governments and certain non-profit institutions or organizations pursuant to this section and sections 553 and 554 of this title.”.

(c) REQUIREMENTS RELATED TO SALES OF REVERTED PROPERTY UNDER SECTION 553.—Section 553(e) of title 40, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting “(1)” after “THIS SECTION.—”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following: “If the Administrator determines that reversion of the property is necessary to enforce compliance with the terms of the conveyance, the Administrator shall take control of such property and, subject to paragraph (2), sell it at or above appraised fair market value for cash and not by lease, exchange, leaseback arrangements, or service agreements.

“(2) Prior to sale, the Administrator shall make such property available to State and local governments and certain non-profit institutions or organizations pursuant to this section and sections 550 and 554 of this title.”.

SEC. 6. AGENCY RETENTION OF PROCEEDS.

The text of section 571 of title 40, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(a) PROCEEDS FROM TRANSFER OR SALE OF REAL PROPERTY.—

“(1) DEPOSIT OF NET PROCEEDS.—Net proceeds described in subsection (d) shall be deposited into the appropriate real property account of the agency that had custody and accountability for the real property at the time the real property is determined to be excess.

“(2) EXPENDITURE OF NET PROCEEDS.—The net proceeds deposited pursuant to paragraph (1) may only be expended as authorized in annual appropriations Acts, for activities described in sections 543 and 545 of this title, including paying costs incurred by the General Services Administration for any disposal-related activity authorized by this title.

“(3) DEFICIT REDUCTION.—Any net proceeds described in subsection (d) from the sale, lease, or other disposition of surplus real property that are not expended under paragraph (2) shall be used for deficit reduction.

“(b) EFFECT ON OTHER SECTIONS.—Nothing in this section is intended to affect section 572(b), 573, or 574 of this title.

“(c) DISPOSAL AGENCY FOR REVERTED PROPERTY.—For the purposes of this section, for any real property that reverts to the United States under sections 550 and 553 of this title, the General Services Administration, as the disposal agency, shall be treated as the agency with custody and accountability for the real property at the time the real property is determined to be excess.

“(d) NET PROCEEDS.—The net proceeds described in this subsection are proceeds under this chapter, less expenses of the transfer or disposition as provided in section 572(a) of this title, from a—

“(1) transfer of excess real property to a Federal agency for agency use; or

“(2) sale, lease, or other disposition of surplus real property.

“(e) PROCEEDS FROM TRANSFER OR SALE OF PERSONAL PROPERTY.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this subchapter, proceeds described in paragraph (2) shall be deposited in the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

“(2) PROCEEDS.—The proceeds described in this paragraph are proceeds under this chapter from—

“(A) a transfer of excess personal property to a Federal agency for agency use; or

“(B) a sale, lease, or other disposition of surplus personal property.

“(3) PAYMENT OF EXPENSES OF SALE BEFORE DEPOSIT.—Subject to regulations under this subtitle, the expenses of the sale of personal property may be paid from the proceeds of sale so that only the net proceeds are deposited in the Treasury. This paragraph applies whether proceeds are deposited as miscellaneous receipts or to the credit of an appropriation as authorized by law.”.

SEC. 7. FEDERAL REAL PROPERTY DATABASE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter II of chapter 5 of title 40, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“§ 530. Federal real property database

“(a) DATABASE REQUIRED.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this section, the Administrator of General Services shall publish a single, comprehensive, and descriptive database of all Federal real property under the custody and control of all executive agencies, other than Federal real property excluded for reasons of national security, in accordance with subsection (b).

“(b) REQUIRED INFORMATION FOR DATABASE.—The Administrator shall collect from the head of each executive agency descriptive information, except for classified information, of the nature, use, and extent of the Federal real property of each such agency, including the following:

“(1) The geographic location of each Federal real property of each such agency, in-

cluding the address and description for each such property.

“(2) The total size of each Federal real property of each such agency, including square footage and acreage of each such property.

“(3) The relevance of each Federal real property to the agency's mission.

“(4) The level of use of each Federal real property for each such agency, including whether such property is excess, surplus, underutilized, or unused.

“(5) The number of days each Federal real property is designated as excess, surplus, underutilized, or unused.

“(6) The annual operating costs of each Federal real property.

“(7) The replacement value of each Federal real property.

“(c) ACCESS TO DATABASE.—

“(1) FEDERAL AGENCIES.—The Administrator shall, in consultation with the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, make the database established and maintained under this section available to other Federal agencies.

“(2) PUBLIC ACCESS.—To the extent consistent with national security, the database shall be accessible by the public at no cost through the website of the General Services Administration.

“(d) TRANSPARENCY OF DATABASE.—To the extent practicable, the Administrator shall ensure that the database—

“(1) uses an open, machine-readable format;

“(2) permits users to search and sort Federal real property data; and

“(3) includes a means to download a large amount of Federal real property data and a selection of such data retrieved using a search.

“(e) APPLICABILITY.—Nothing in this section may be construed to require an agency to make available to the public information that is exempt from disclosure pursuant to section 552(b) of title 5.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 5 of title 40, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 529 the following new item:

“530. Federal real property database.”.

SEC. 8. SUSTAINABLE DISPOSAL OF PROPERTY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter III of chapter 5 of title 40, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“§ 560. Sustainable disposal of property

“The head of each Federal agency shall divert at least 50 percent of construction and demolition materials and debris by the end of fiscal year 2015.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 5 of title 40, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 559 the following new item:

“560. Sustainable disposal of property.”.

SEC. 9. STREAMLINING THE MCKINNEY-VENTO HOMELESS ASSISTANCE ACT.

Section 501 of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11411) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by adding at the end the following new sentence: “Agencies shall not be required to submit information to the Secretary regarding properties located in an area for which the general public is denied access in the interest of national security.”;

(2) in subsection (c)(1)(A), by striking “in the Federal Register” and inserting the following: “on the website of the Department of Housing and Urban Development or the General Services Administration”; and

(3) in subsection (d)(3), by adding at the end the following new sentence: “If no such

review of the determination is requested within the 20-day period, such property will not be included in subsequent publications unless the landholding agency reclassifies the property as available and the Secretary subsequently determines the property is suitable.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. QUIGLEY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 665, the Excess Federal Building and Property Disposal Act of 2012, was favorably reported by voice vote by the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform in November of last year. I'm proud to be one of the sponsors of this bill. There are 39 cosponsors of this bill, and, in particular, I want to thank my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. QUIGLEY) for his great and passionate work on this, Mr. CONNOLLY, and Ms. NORTON. There are a number of people on both sides of the aisle that have passionately worked on this issue.

I'm proud to report, Mr. Speaker, that this is very bipartisan in its nature. I also want to thank our chairman, Chairman ISSA, who was very instrumental in passing it out of committee to the floor, as well as Ranking Member CUMMINGS and certainly our majority leader, Mr. CANTOR, for allowing and encouraging this bill to come to the floor. So I appreciate the bipartisan nature.

These are the types of things that we should be doing as a body to make sure that we're improving the process and streamlining the disposal of real property that happens in this country. Most are somewhat amazed to understand that our Federal Government has roughly 900,000 buildings and structures under its ownership. The GAO in 2011 estimated that the Federal Government holds 45,000 underutilized properties that cost nearly \$1.7 billion annually in order to operate. And, again, these are underutilized. In fact, more recently, OMB Controller Daniel Werfel testified before a Senate subcommittee that the government controls 14,000 excess and 76,000 underutilized buildings and structures. That's going to happen when you consume and have so many Federal buildings. We have to make sure that we, as a government, are also streamlining and moving forward with the disposal of these properties when they become

something that is not as frequently used.

The Federal Government has accumulated excess properties because the disposal process is, in many ways, flawed. In 2003 and in 2011, the GAO designated Federal real property management as a high-risk area to the Federal Government. Thus, I think, as an independent group, going out, looking and assessing the situation, have come to the conclusion that we as the Federal Government believe this is a high-risk area that costs well over \$1 billion a year, is starting to approach \$2 billion a year and that it certainly is in need of some restructuring.

So the Excess Federal Building and Property Disposal Act would streamline the disposal of high-valued properties while also overhauling the existing disposal process. The bill creates a 5-year pilot program that would expedite the disposal of Federal properties with the goal of maximizing profit. Ninety-eight percent of the proceeds under the pilot would be directed to the United States Treasury General Fund, and 2 percent would be authorized for use by homeless assistance providers, as has been the history of this government in the past.

The bill also permanently streamlines the existing disposal process by reducing administrative overhead, creating new agency incentives, and requiring greater transparency and accountability from the federal agencies. Again, this bill is bipartisan; it will direct revenue to the United States Treasury; it reduces operating and maintenance budgets; and it's presented in a bipartisan way.

I would encourage all of my colleagues to support this bill. The nature and the approach that we're taking here, I think, is just good government. It's smarter, more streamlined, more efficient, and moves the ball in the right direction.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE,

Washington, DC, March 20, 2012.

Hon. DARRELL E. ISSA,
Chairman, Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing with respect to the jurisdictional interest of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure in matters being considered in H.R. 665, the Excess Federal Building and Property Disposal Act of 2011, which was referred to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

Our Committee recognizes the desire of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform to move H.R. 665 expeditiously. Therefore, while we have a valid claim to jurisdiction over a number of provisions in the bill related to public buildings and improved grounds of the United States and waivers of certain no-cost conveyances, including those related to aviation and highways, I do not object to bringing the legislation to the floor without action by this Committee. This, of course, is conditional on our mutual understanding that nothing in this legislation or my decision to forego any referral waivers, reduces or otherwise affects the jurisdiction of

the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

The Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure also asks that you support our request to be conferees on the provisions over which we have jurisdiction during any House-Senate conference. I would appreciate it if you would include a copy of this letter and of your response acknowledging our jurisdictional interest as part of the Congressional Record during consideration of the bill by the House.

Thank you for your cooperation in this matter.

Sincerely,

JOHN L. MICA,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM,

Washington, DC, March 20, 2012.

Hon. JOHN L. MICA,
Chairman, Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MICA: Thank you for your letter of March 19, 2012, regarding H.R. 665, the Excess Federal Building and Property Disposal Act of 2011. Your assistance in expediting consideration of the bill is very much appreciated.

I agree that there are provisions in the bill that are of jurisdictional interest to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and I agree that by foregoing a referral the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure is not waiving its jurisdiction.

I would be pleased to support the representation of your Committee in any conference on H.R. 665 on matters within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. And, as you have requested, I will include this exchange of letters in the Congressional Record. Thank you for your cooperation and your continued leadership and support in surface transportation matters.

Sincerely,

DARRELL ISSA,
Chairman.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to thank the chairman of the full committee, Mr. ISSA, for his staunch support of this bill, and I also want to thank my good friend Mr. CHAFFETZ for working so closely with us to craft this bipartisan bill and in working to get it to the floor today. Finally, I want to thank the ranking member of the full committee, Mr. CUMMINGS, for working with me on this important bill.

There could not be a better time to move a measure like this one through the Congress. We are facing an unsustainable budget deficit, and we must get our fiscal house in order. One of the best ways to achieve much-needed reductions in spending is to create efficiencies and cut waste. This is exactly what this bipartisan measure accomplishes.

□ 1230

The Federal Government is the largest property owner in the world, with an inventory of over 900,000 buildings and structures and 41 million acres of land. Yet we waste billions of tax dollars each year in maintaining properties we no longer need.

The Federal Government currently maintains 14,000 buildings and structures deemed "excess" and over 76,000 properties identified as "underutilized." In fiscal year 2009, these underutilized buildings cost us \$1.7 billion to operate annually.

The GAO has continuously found that many properties are no longer relevant to their Agencies' missions and that Agencies could do a better job of identifying and disposing of unneeded properties. H.R. 665, as amended, will finally give Agencies the tools they need to quickly and efficiently dispose of unneeded Federal properties, resulting in huge savings to the government.

First, H.R. 665 creates a 5-year pilot program to expedite the sale of unused, high-value properties. The Office of Management and Budget, also with the General Services Administration, will work with Agencies to dispose of 15 high-value properties. This list of properties for disposal will be a rolling list, meaning, as properties are sold, additional properties will be added to the list for disposal. Ninety-eight percent of the proceeds from the sale of these high-valued properties will go straight to the Treasury for deficit reduction while 2 percent will be set aside for a grant to fund homeless assistance programs.

In addition to the 5-year pilot, H.R. 665, as amended, modernizes the existing property disposal process and removes barriers to disposal. H.R. 665 empowers GSA to provide agencies with much needed technical expertise to dispose of unused and unneeded properties.

The bill also allows all Agencies to use the proceeds generated from the sale of property, as authorized by Congress, to cover the costs of disposal. Currently, property disposal costs can be hugely expensive. Without the ability to use the proceeds of a sale to cover the costs of disposal, Agencies have little incentive to dispose of these properties. Any funds not used to prepare and dispose of property would be paid to the Treasury for debt reduction.

H.R. 665, as amended, will also provide unprecedented transparency and accountability to the Federal Government's property portfolio. The bill will require GSA to report to Congress annually on the number, value, and maintenance costs of all Federal property. This information will be made available to the public at no cost in an online database.

Finally, this bipartisan bill reforms our property disposal process without creating a new bureaucracy, and is at no cost to the Federal Government.

H.R. 665, as amended, passed unanimously through the Oversight and Government Reform Committee. I encourage my colleagues to support this commonsense bill designed to improve government efficiency and save the taxpayers billions.

Again, I want to thank Mr. CHAFFETZ for his good work on a bipartisan effort toward this extraordinary bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional speakers. I just want to simply thank the gentleman from Illinois. He's truly one who will stand on principle and work on both sides of the aisle, and for that we're very grateful and appreciative. This is what we are supposed to be doing, working in a bipartisan way.

H.R. 665, as amended, is a good bill. It's good government, it's something we should do, and I would urge all of my colleagues to support it. I appreciate all the support from our leadership in making this point happen.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I am in support of important legislation on Federal real property disposal. I believe that we have found a bipartisan solution to the deficiencies that currently exist in real property management in H.R. 665.

The Federal Government has costly and pressing problems disposing of its unneeded real property, which includes its public buildings and lands. As a result, the GAO has placed this issue on its "high risk" list. Unneeded and under-utilized buildings are languishing in the Federal inventory when their sale could generate much-needed revenue for the national treasury. Maintenance of these buildings costs the government nearly \$1.7 billion in fiscal year 2010 alone. In tough times like those we face today, this waste is simply unacceptable.

In this Congress, four separate pieces of legislation have been introduced to help solve the problem. H.R. 665 combines the best elements of these legislative proposals and creates a timely and workable method of disposing of excess Federal property while generating the highest possible financial returns.

The bill would establish a five-year pilot program to dispose of the 15 highest value unneeded Federal real properties.

The Federal Government will clearly gain from the disposal of these properties. Not only will the fair market value generate income, but we will realize significant savings by eliminating maintenance and operating costs.

I also support H.R. 665 because it will provide aid to organizations dedicated to helping those most vulnerable among us, the homeless. This legislation permits Congress to appropriate the equivalent of two (2) percent of the proceeds from the sale of these properties to fund grants to eligible organizations that serve the homeless. This requirement preserves our commitment to the goals of the McKinney Vento Homeless Assistance Act.

This bill will also expand transparency surrounding the disposal of Federal property. It requires that GSA report annually to Congress on the number, market value and deferred maintenance costs of all executive branch real property assets. The report would also include ongoing operating costs of surplus properties so that we are always aware of the expenses that empty, unused properties are incurring. The public will also be able to access information on all real Federal property through a database required to be established by GSA.

Agencies will also be allowed to retain the net proceeds from the disposition of real property, and use those funds to maintain, repair,

and dispose of their other properties. Net proceeds not used for such costs would be used for deficit reduction. This provision will incentivize agencies to move properties quickly through the disposal process and will keep revenues moving into the Treasury.

I am pleased that we have been able to produce a bipartisan solution to a problem that wastes taxpayer dollars maintaining unneeded Federal buildings. I support H.R. 665 as amended and I hope that we can get this legislation working for America as soon as possible.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 665, the Excess Federal Building and Property Disposal Act of 2011. This important bipartisan legislation will decrease the deficit by selling excess federal buildings and property by empowering the executive branch to more quickly dispose of excess federal property. This bill would also permanently modernize the existing disposal process through reductions in administrative overhead. This bill also requires greater accountability from those responsible for federal property disposal.

The federal government owns a staggering one-third of the United States and owns more real property than any other entity in America: 900,000 buildings and structures covering 3.38 billion square feet. According to a February 10, 2011 Government Accountability Office (GAO) report, 24 federal agencies identified 45,190 underutilized buildings that cost \$1.66 billion annually to operate. More recently, Office of Management and Budget Comptroller Daniel Werfel testified before a Senate Subcommittee that the government controls even more, with 14,000 excess buildings and structures and 76,000 underutilized properties. This large inventory of underutilized federal property is the product of a convoluted and inefficient disposal process.

H.R. 665 works to correct this by establishing a five-year pilot program, beginning on the date that the legislation is enacted, to dispose of excess federal property. The Director of the Office of Management and Budget and the Administrator of the General Services Administration (GSA) would identify, with input from federal agencies, the 15 excess properties with the highest market value. These properties will be disposed of through public auction, and after one property is sold, the GSA will have 15 days to identify another property to replace the auctioned property on the list for disposal. Ninety-eight percent of profits will be deposited into the Treasury and 2 percent will be directed toward the Department of Housing and Urban Development to provide grants for homeless assistance.

Selling off unused federal property would allow the federal government to focus our limited fiscal resources on maintaining the property the United States currently owns. I strongly urge my colleagues to support the Excess Federal Building and Property Disposal Act to begin prioritizing the public auction of unused federal property and reducing the nation's \$15 trillion national debt.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 665, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 34 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1347

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. GINGREY of Georgia) at 1 o'clock and 47 minutes p.m.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2087, REMOVING RESTRICTIONS FOR ACCOMACK COUNTY LAND PARCEL

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 587 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 587

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2087) to remove restrictions from a parcel of land situated in the Atlantic District, Accomack County, Virginia. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources now printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those received for printing in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII in a daily issue dated March 19, 2012, and except pro forma amendments for the purpose of debate. Each amendment so received may be offered only by the Member who caused it to be printed or a designee and shall be considered as read if printed. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the

House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, this proposed rule seeks to waive House rules requiring disclosure of any earmarks in the underlying bill, H.R. 2087. Therefore, pursuant to clause 9 of rule XXI of the rules of the House, I make a point of order against consideration of this rule.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Arizona makes a point of order that the resolution violates clause 9(b) of rule XXI.

Under clause 9(b) of rule XXI, the gentleman from Arizona and the gentleman from Utah each will control 10 minutes of debate on the question of consideration.

Following the debate, the Chair will put the question of consideration as follows: "Will the House now consider the resolution?"

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, the majority frequently congratulates itself for adopting a policy "banning" earmarks. Republican leadership often points to the earmark ban as an important accomplishment in improving the legislative process.

It should be noted, for the record, the provision requiring the disclosure of earmarks was inserted into the rules of the House during the 110th Congress, under a Democratic majority.

The American people might be surprised to learn that, despite claims of strict opposition to earmarks, the majority is bringing a proposed rule to the House floor that would not only allow an earmark in the underlying bill, but even waives the basic requirement that such an earmark be disclosed.

Clause 9 of rule XXI of the rules of the House specifically states that it shall not be in order to consider a rule that waives the requirement to disclose earmarks, and yet the rule the majority is seeking to call up specifically states, "All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived."

And the question of whether the underlying bill, H.R. 2087, contains an earmark is critical. If enacted, the bill would transfer full ownership of Federal land to a county in Virginia. All parties agree the land has an appraised value of \$815,000, but the bill would transfer this Federal land to the county for free. The county is in the congressional district represented by the sponsor of the legislation.

This is not county land; this is Federal land. The county has been granted limited authority to control this land as long as it is used for public recreation. According to the deed, the county cannot sell the land or rent it or lease it or develop it. Only H.R. 2087 will give the county this land with no limitation.

I suspect that every Member of this House would like to be able to pass legislation giving his or her constituents an \$815,000 windfall.

Mr. Speaker, either this is an earmark, and the majority should follow its own rules and not bring this rule or the underlying bill to the floor, or this is not an earmark, and the waiver should be removed from the rule. Either way, the proposed rule is a clear violation of House rules and should not be taken up by this House.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am obviously in favor of consideration of this resolution.

The question before the House is: Shall the House now consider House Resolution 587?

While the resolution waives all points of order against consideration of the bill, the committee is not aware of any point of order. The waiver is a complete waiver in nature.

Note, there is not a specific waiver against an earmark simply because the bill contains no earmarks. It is in compliance with the earmark definition provided for us in the House Rules, a rule that goes back to, actually—to make the record complete—the 109th Session of Congress and the earmark ban instituted by the House Republicans when they took the majority in January of last year.

As is required by House Rules, the committee report filed for this bill on January 18 includes a specific determination and statement that the bill does not contain an earmark. I will quote from page 5 of the report: The bill does not contain any congressional earmarks or limited tax benefits or limited tariff benefits as defined by the Rules of the House of Representatives.

With all due respect to my friend from Arizona, each person may have his own perception of what an earmark is, but, with all due respect, the term "congressional earmark" means a provision that provides or authorizes or recommends a specific amount of discretionary budget authority, credit authority, or other spending authority or expenditures with or to an entity. It has to have money involved in it.

Specifically, the definition of an earmark requires that there be spending in the form directed to an entity or targeted geographically. This bill does not involve the spending of money or loan authority or credit authority or any other form of payment of funds.

The land in question is already with the county. It will remain with the county. Whether we pass this bill or not, it is still with the county. The only issue is the deed restriction, not the value of the land, not the transfer of money.

This parcel is with Virginia on Federal land that at one time had a deed restriction. It simply removes that deal.

The CBO viewed and scored this bill, and concluded it would not cost money, stating it "would have no significant impact on the Federal budget."

Moreover, this type of bill, clearing the title to land, has repeatedly been approved when the House has been controlled by both Republicans and Democrats. The definition of an earmark is clear. There has not been a fiscal impact, and this bill does not meet the House rules definition used by either Democrats or Republicans.

This is really a red herring to stop economic development and the creation of jobs caused by lingering Federal bureaucratic red tape.

This county is one of the poorest counties in the Commonwealth of Virginia, with more than 16 percent of its population living in poverty and a higher rate of unemployment than the rest of Virginia. This very small bill, at no cost to the Federal taxpayer, will help to turn that around.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, under current law, the county controls these 32 acres of Federal land, but the deed clearly states that the county may not sell or lease the land or use it for anything other than public recreation. The county received control of the land with those restrictions in 1976, free of charge.

The underlying bill, H.R. 2087, will remove all restrictions from the deed. The county would be free to sell the land or lease it or do whatever it wants with it and pocket any and all revenue. This is clearly an \$815,000 windfall for the county created specifically by this bill.

Regardless of whether you agree the bill is an earmark, the proposal from the Rules Committee to waive the earmark disclosure rule should also be cause for concern. If H.R. 2087 contains no earmarks, why is the waiver necessary? Why have an earmark disclosure rule if you just waive it every time you bring a bill to the floor?

Any Member who has ever claimed to oppose earmarks should insist that the rule waiving the disclosure requirement be rejected.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, once again, the rule does not waive an earmark, because there are no earmarks. It is a general waiver that is in there. If one were to look back at the past three Congresses, official bills that have been prepared that are very similar to this have also included the same type of language and were determined as not to have an earmark. Specifically, go back to H.R. 944 in the 112th Congress, H.R. 86 in the 111th Congress, H.R. 356 in the 110th Congress, H.R. 2246 in the 110th Congress, and S. 404 in the 112th Congress—same language, same situation, same condition.

Once again, the rules of our House say this is not an earmark. The CBO

says it's not an earmark, because it is not an earmark. There is no transfer of money. The county has the land. The county will continue to have the land. The only thing this is about is the deed restriction. Deed restrictions are not earmarks.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1400

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, reading from the remarks to the Natural Resources subcommittee from Thursday, September 15, by the sponsor of this legislation, he stated a recent appraisal valued the land at \$815,000, which is more than \$25,000 per acre.

There is economic gain for the county, and waiving the disclosure only adds to the confusion that the public feels when we say we have a ban on earmarks and yet we are waiving rules that would disclose that and fully be transparent as to the kinds of decisions we're making with public lands.

The CBO is unable to value what public land is worth. It's certainly here in the testimony of the sponsor of this legislation. The appraisal value is listed, and that, to me, leads to the conclusion that this is an earmark and that the rule that is presently before us should be rejected.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Let me try and once again put this in perspective.

The Federal Government, in and of itself, owns no land, especially in one of the original 13 States.

Virginia had the land and gave it to the Federal Government. In 1976, the Federal Government gave this back to the county with a lease for a park and restrictions, a deed restriction only. There is no transfer of money if we take away the deed restriction. There is no transfer of authority. The county has it. The county will continue to have it.

The dollar value that was given was made up in the minds of the Department of the Interior. This county actually said, if you really want more parkland, we will create 32 acres somewhere else for more parkland. The Department of the Interior said, No, let's have cash instead. They are the ones that determined that this land was worth 25 grand an acre, asking almost a million dollars from one of the poorest counties. They came up with that on their own. That does not mean it's reality.

The reality is the county has the land. The county will continue to have the land. There is no transfer of dollars. There is no loss from taxpayers in America. Actually, these guys who live in Virginia are taxpayers, too. Transferring from one pocket to the other is a ridiculous requirement to place on them, and all we're talking about is a deed restriction—how can we best use the land to actually help people.

Now, if the other side does not care about this county, does not care about the 16 percent of the population living in poverty, does not care about the unemployment rate, does not care that

they actually use this land in a logical, rational manner, I can understand that. It still doesn't mean that's an earmark.

The point of order is a delay tactic of today's consideration of this legislation.

Sometimes in the past, a couple of other Members who have declared what I think are earmarks as non-earmarks have always used the old cliché if it walks like a duck, quacks like a duck, it's probably a duck. But as Hans Christian Andersen told us, sometimes those ducks you perceive are actually the honking of a swan. This bill is a swan. This bill will help these people to produce themselves.

This point of order has no merit to it. In order to allow the House to continue its scheduled business of the day, I urge Members to vote "yes" on the question of consideration of this resolution.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

The question is, Will the House now consider the resolution?

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 227, nays 172, not voting 32, as follows:

[Roll No. 112]

YEAS—227

Adams	Dent	Hensarling
Aderholt	DesJarlais	Henger
Alexander	Diaz-Balart	Herrera Beutler
Amash	Dreier	Huelskamp
Austria	Duffy	Huizenga (MI)
Bachmann	Duncan (SC)	Hultgren
Barletta	Duncan (TN)	Hunter
Bartlett	Ellmers	Hurt
Barton (TX)	Emerson	Issa
Bass (NH)	Farenthold	Jenkins
Benishek	Fincher	Johnson (IL)
Berg	Fitzpatrick	Johnson (OH)
Biggert	Flake	Johnson, Sam
Bilbray	Fleischmann	Jones
Bilirakis	Fleming	Jordan
Bishop (UT)	Flores	Kelly
Black	Forbes	King (IA)
Blackburn	Fortenberry	King (NY)
Bonner	Fox	Kingston
Boustany	Franks (AZ)	Kissell
Brooks	Frelinghuysen	Kline
Broun (GA)	Gallegly	Labrador
Buchanan	Gardner	Lamborn
Bucshon	Garrett	Lance
Buerkle	Gerlach	Landry
Burgess	Gibbs	Lankford
Burton (IN)	Gibson	Latham
Calvert	Gingrey (GA)	LaTourette
Camp	Gohmert	Latta
Campbell	Goodlatte	LoBiondo
Canseco	Gosar	Long
Cantor	Gowdy	Lucas
Capito	Granger	Luetkemeyer
Carter	Graves (GA)	Lummis
Cassidy	Graves (MO)	Lungren, Daniel
Chabot	Griffin (AR)	E.
Chaffetz	Griffith (VA)	Mack
Coble	Grimm	Marchant
Coffman (CO)	Guinta	McCarthy (CA)
Cole	Guthrie	McCauley
Conaway	Hall	McClintock
Cravaack	Hanna	McCotter
Crawford	Harper	McHenry
Crenshaw	Harris	McKeon
Culberson	Hastings (WA)	McKinley
Davis (KY)	Hayworth	McMorris
Denham	Heck	Rodgers

Meehan	Rigell
Mica	Rivera
Miller (FL)	Roby
Miller (MI)	Roe (TN)
Miller, Gary	Rogers (AL)
Mulvaney	Rogers (KY)
Murphy (PA)	Rogers (MI)
Myrick	Rohrabacher
Neugebauer	Rokita
Nugent	Rooney
Nunes	Ros-Lehtinen
Nunnelee	Roskam
Olson	Ross (FL)
Palazzo	Royce
Paulsen	Runyan
Pearce	Ryan (WI)
Pence	Scalise
Petri	Schilling
Pitts	Schmidt
Platts	Schweikert
Poe (TX)	Scott (SC)
Pompeo	Scott, Austin
Posey	Sensenbrenner
Price (GA)	Sessions
Quayle	Shimkus
Reed	Shuster
Rehberg	Simpson
Reichert	Smith (NE)
Renacci	Smith (NJ)
Ribble	Smith (TX)

NAYS—172

Ackerman	Fattah	Olver
Altmire	Filner	Owens
Andrews	Frank (MA)	Pallone
Baca	Fudge	Pascarelli
Baldwin	Garamendi	Pastor (AZ)
Barrow	Green, Al	Pelosi
Becerra	Green, Gene	Perlmutter
Berkley	Grijalva	Peters
Berman	Gutierrez	Peterson
Bishop (GA)	Hahn	Pingree (ME)
Bishop (NY)	Hanabusa	Polis
Blumenauer	Hastings (FL)	Price (NC)
Bonamici	Heinrich	Quigley
Boren	Higgins	Rahall
Boswell	Himes	Reyes
Brady (PA)	Hinchey	Richardson
Braley (IA)	Hinojosa	Richmond
Brown (FL)	Hochul	Ross (AR)
Butterfield	Holden	Rothman (NJ)
Capps	Holt	Roybal-Allard
Capuano	Hoyer	Ruppersberger
Cardoza	Israel	Ryan (OH)
Carnahan	Jackson Lee	Sánchez, Linda
Carney	(TX)	T.
Carson (IN)	Johnson (GA)	Sanchez, Loretta
Castor (FL)	Johnson, E. B.	Sarbanes
Chandler	Kaptur	Schakowsky
Chu	Keating	Schiff
Ciulline	Kildee	Schrader
Clarke (MI)	Kind	Schwartz
Clarke (NY)	Kucinich	Scott (VA)
Clay	Langevin	Scott, David
Cleaver	Larsen (WA)	Serrano
Clyburn	Levin	Sewell
Cohen	Lewis (GA)	Sherman
Connolly (VA)	Loebach	Shuler
Conyers	Lofgren, Zoe	Sires
Cooper	Lowe	Slaughter
Costa	Luján	Smith (WA)
Costello	Lynch	Speier
Courtney	Maloney	Sutton
Critz	Markey	Thompson (CA)
Crowley	Matheson	Thompson (MS)
Cuellar	Matsui	Tierney
Cummings	McCollum	Tonko
Davis (CA)	McDermott	Towns
DeFazio	McGovern	Tsongas
DeGette	McIntyre	Visclosky
DeLauro	McNerney	Walz (MN)
Deutch	Meeks	Wasserman
Dicks	Michaud	Schultz
Dingell	Miller (NC)	Waters
Donnelly (IN)	Miller, George	Watt
Doyle	Moore	Waxman
Edwards	Moran	Welch
Ellison	Murphy (CT)	Wilson (FL)
Engel	Nadler	Woolsey
Eshoo	Napolitano	
Farr	Neal	

NOT VOTING—32

Davis (IL)	Honda
Doggett	Jackson (IL)
Dold	Kinzinger (IL)
Gonzalez	Larson (CT)
Hartzler	Lee (CA)
Hirono	Lewis (CA)

Lipinski
Manzullo
Marino
McCarthy (NY)
Noem

Paul
Rangel
Rush
Schock
Stark

Van Hollen
Velázquez
Walsh (IL)
Yarmuth

□ 1432

Messrs. WELCH, HEINRICH, Mrs. MALONEY, and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. BILBRAY and McCARTHY of California changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the question of consideration was decided in the affirmative.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 112, had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. AKIN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall Nos. 111 and 112, I was delayed and unable to vote. Had I been present I would have voted "yea" on both.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. YODER). The gentleman from Utah is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. For purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlelady from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. The resolution provides for a modified open rule for the consideration of H.R. 2087, a bill to remove certain restrictions from a parcel of land that's situated in the Atlantic District of Accomack County, in Virginia. It provides for 1 hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources. This rule makes in order all amendments that were preprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and which otherwise comply with the rules of the House.

So this modified rule is a very fair rule. It is a generous rule. It will provide for a balanced and open debate on the merits of this bill that is not an earmark.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Utah, my colleague (Mr. BISHOP), for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and yield myself such time as I may consume.

We begin yet another week of inaction in the House of Representatives. Last week, our colleagues in the Senate, working together in a bipartisan

fashion, approved a transportation bill that would be the biggest job creation measure this body has considered in this Congress. But are we talking about a bipartisan job creation bill in the House? No.

Instead of creating thousands of jobs through a bipartisan transportation bill that has already passed the Senate, and just awaits our action, we are talking about an \$800,000 earmark to benefit a single county in a single State. And if somebody talked about the day's work that we were getting around to, this is it.

In other words, instead of creating the millions of new jobs that would result from a strong bipartisan transportation bill, we're spending the entire day debating a bill that affects 32 acres of land in a single State. No other community in America has received the kind of special treatment that is provided to a single community in this bill. This earmark hardly seems like a fiscally responsible way to create jobs and to protect the tax dollars of our hardworking American citizens.

This is not the first time the Federal Government has had to make decisions about transferring public lands to new uses. Fortunately, there is an established procedure in existing law to ensure that the taxpayers get just compensation in such cases. We are being asked today to ignore that. Instead of letting the National Park Service and the local community handle the transfer of this land in the tried-and-true way, the majority proposes making a one-time exception—an \$800,000 earmark for a single community.

If this majority were serious about job creation, we would right now be discussing the Senate-passed transportation bill. But instead, as I said before, we've spent an entire day of this week debating 32 acres of land.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the rule and the underlying legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to the sponsor of this bill, who will once again try to describe to this body how this county land should stay with the county and needs to be dealt with by the county and all we have to do is remove an unnecessary restriction on its deed.

With that, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. RIGELL).

Mr. RIGELL. I thank the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. Speaker, it's a real privilege today to speak on behalf of the bill that I'm introducing. It is indeed a jobs bill. It is a bill that reflects common sense. It's a bill that reflects common ground. And I think, importantly, it reflects the wisdom and the will of the good, hardworking residents of Accomack County in Virginia, whom I have the privilege of representing. It enjoyed bipartisan support in coming out of committee, and it enjoys and should enjoy and merits today bipartisan support when it comes before the full House for a vote.

Here's why if it's passed it will work toward job creation. Unlike so many measures that some have proposed, instead of looking to Washington to actually spend more money or for Washington to do something, the folks of Accomack County are simply asking for the Federal Government to get out of the way and allow the greatest job-producing engine the world has ever known, Mr. Speaker, the American entrepreneur, to go forward and to put hardworking folks to work and put precious and limited capital to work.

This bill simply removes a deed restriction. That's all it does. And this deed restriction is, in effect, a restriction on job creation. It's a restriction on much needed tax revenue that this county so desperately needs. Sixteen percent unemployment; sixteen percent of the folks there live at the poverty level.

Accomack County is 90 percent agricultural, a bit of tourism, and then the NASA Wallops Facility. This piece of property is adjacent to the NASA Wallops Facility; and presently, with this deed restriction, they can't use it at all for any economic growth or opportunity. Removing this deed restriction will allow the board of supervisors there to move forward with their Wallops Research Park. They are desperate to get this done, and I am ready to help them today.

Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned earlier, this bill enjoyed bipartisan support in committee. It does not require any money coming from the Federal Government. We're simply asking for the Federal Government to get out of the way and let the hardworking folks of Accomack County get on with job creation.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I just wish to make a comment or two. The most unusual thing about this bill is that when we have a Federal land swap and a deed that goes with it, they're always the same—you can use this land for public purposes. Should you decide not to use this land for public purposes, it reverts to the government. It's as simple as that.

So what we're doing now is giving away \$800,000 that belongs to my constituents, your constituents, and everybody else's constituents. We're giving away the tax money. I have got a good idea because there's a Democrat amendment today that can remedy that, and it says the county can pay for the land with the revenues they get from developing the land and renting it out. That way we'll get our money back; the county should be very happy; and we hope that a lot of jobs are created there.

□ 1440

May I inquire, Mr. Speaker, if my colleague is ready to close?

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I would be more than happy to close at any time you are ready.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I am ready.

In closing today, let me reiterate what I've said all along: This is not a

jobs bill. It does nothing to put millions of unemployed Americans back to work. By considering this bill, the majority has made a decision that it is more important to vote on an earmark than to vote on a transportation bill that would create thousands of jobs, perhaps millions, throughout the United States and had strong, bipartisan support. We must do something because, as we know, the current legislation will expire at the end of this month.

If the House passes today's legislation, we will have taken a vote, but we will not have helped the American people. We all know we were not sent here to avoid solving the pressing problems facing our constituents, and we certainly weren't sent here to spend our days giving away public land so one county in one State could receive a windfall while all the rest of the taxpayers get nothing.

I urge my colleagues to get back to the single biggest problem facing the country—the lack of jobs—and to vote on the bipartisan Senate transportation bill, which easily passed the Senate 74-22. Until we do, we are just treading water as our roads, bridges, and highways crumble and our constituents are neglected.

I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on today's rule and the underlying legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to speak in favor of the underlying bill. The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. RIGELL) knows his constituents; he knows the needs there and has worked very hard for their benefit.

This, as we already discussed and voted, is not an earmark. The gentleman from New York introduced a heritage area for Niagara Falls that got \$10 million sent from the Federal Government to that place. That was officially not an earmark. This bill has no money going anywhere. The land is the county's, no exchange of profit whatsoever. There is no earmark, and there is no money being exchanged.

This land was originally Virginia's land. They gave it to the Federal Government for a Federal purpose. Thirty-six years ago, the Federal Government, in no longer needing the land, gave it back to this county for a public park. As a public park, it is useless. Now that's the common bond here. It is not needed as a park; it is not used as a park; there is no parking; it is inaccessible; and it is lousy for that purpose. The county, though, would like to use their land to do economic development because that is where it is and for what it would best be used, how it would help the public and the general good if it were used for economic development. All they need is the Federal Government to graciously grant a deed restriction, which they refuse to do—for whatever purpose, no one really knows, but they won't do it. That is why the county needs to keep the county land,

to do something that is common sense, simply use the land for the purpose in which it best suits the needs of the people.

I don't know why the Department of the Interior, in its infinite wisdom, decides they want to tell the county in Virginia what is best for Virginia, but that is exactly what they are trying to do by being hard-nosed, not on a law, but on an internal rule from the Department of the Interior.

Look, this government already controls 1 out of every 3 acres in this Nation. One-third of America is controlled by the Federal Government. That means the Federal Government's in-holdings are larger than any country's in the world, with the exception of Russia's and Canada's. That's what we already have. And yet the Department of the Interior is straining over 32 acres that shouldn't be a park and that need to be used to help the people of this particular county, and that is simply illogical. It is irrational.

I have faced similar circumstances in countless bills that we have had and passed before this body. There was public land in the middle of Park City in my district that was controlled by the Bureau of Land Management. They didn't need it; they didn't want it; they didn't use it. It was actually being occupied by squatters. The city had no control over it because it was public land, and yet the Department of the Interior did not want to let go of that land because the control was already there.

We passed another bill earlier that went through the House and the Senate that transferred land that the Forest Service had that they didn't even know they had. We had to do a title search to remind them, oh, yeah, that actually is ours. They didn't need it; they didn't want it; they didn't use it; and after 6 years, we finally got them to give it up so it could be used for a better purpose.

We have another bill for 2 acres in Alta that the Park Service doesn't want to give up, for whatever reason, even though on that 2 acres there is already the city building, a public safety building, and public bathrooms for the community and those that go to that ski resort; and yet the Forest Service, in this case, doesn't want to give that up for whatever reason there may be.

Mr. Speaker, we were just in a hearing earlier this morning that dealt with a proposed Eisenhower memorial. In all due respect, I just recently read a biography of Eisenhower. When he was just a lieutenant in the Army, he had his first child, and he applied for and received permission for a housing increase that he thought he deserved and so did the commanding officer who approved that housing increase. A little while later, they did an audit, and the acting inspector general did an audit and found out that there was a technicality to which General Eisenhower was not entitled to that housing increase. When he was confronted with that, he immediately apologized and

said he was more than willing to pay back the \$250.67 that he owed the government.

But that wasn't good enough for the inspector general. That acting inspector general wanted a court-martial because that was what the rules were. That acting inspector general had this blind fetish for fealty to follow rules because that's what bureaucrats always want to do. Fortunately, there was a commanding officer that realized that this young Army officer had a talent and an ability and intervened and allowed General, then Lieutenant, Eisenhower simply to pay the \$250.67 and get on with it.

It is amazing to consider what this Nation and what this world would be like if Lieutenant Eisenhower had actually been court-martialed over \$250.67 because that was the rule.

We have the same situation, 32 acres that is useless. Right now it has no purpose. It sits there, and the Federal Government wants to deny a county in Virginia the ability to do something useful to help people on 32 acres because it violates their internal rule. There has to be some time when common sense takes over and we actually do things because it's the right thing to do, because it is the better thing to do.

Fortunately, there was an officer in Texas that realized, in the case of General Eisenhower, common sense should take over. It would be nice, it would be wonderful if, within the Department of the Interior, there were some element of common sense that said it is stupid what we are doing with this land. We need simply to use common sense and use the land for a better, better purpose.

There is no transfer of land. The county has it. If we don't pass this bill, the county will still have it. They just can't use it effectively.

If we pass this bill, there will be no transfer of money. All you're saying is the county can use the county's land to do something the county needs to help the people in that county. And, honestly, should that not be our goal? Is that not our purpose, to actually use common sense? Or do we have the bureaucratic blood running through our veins that we put these little blinders on and, unless we check the right box, it doesn't matter if it helps, it doesn't matter if it's good, it doesn't matter if it's possible, we won't do it because of our internal rules?

That is, indeed, where this country and this Congress has come. There is something definitely wrong with us.

This rule is a fair rule. It will provide for a good debate. It provides for all those amendments that were preprinted and are in order to be debated here on the floor.

Let us proceed forward with this bill. Let's help this county that desperately needs our help and that desperately needs us just to use some good, old-fashioned common sense. Vote “yes” on this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on adoption of House Resolution 587 will be followed by a 5-minute vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 665.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 232, nays 170, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 113]

YEAS—232

Adams	Frelinghuysen	McCaul
Aderholt	Gallegly	McClintock
Alexander	Gardner	McCotter
Amash	Garrett	McHenry
Amodei	Gerlach	McIntyre
Austria	Gibbs	McKeon
Bachmann	Gibson	McKinley
Barletta	Gingrey (GA)	McMorris
Bartlett	Gohmert	Rodgers
Barton (TX)	Goodlatte	Mica
Bass (NH)	Gosar	Michaud
Benishek	Gowdy	Miller (FL)
Berg	Granger	Miller (MI)
Biggert	Graves (GA)	Miller, Gary
Bilbray	Graves (MO)	Mulvaney
Bilirakis	Griffin (AR)	Murphy (PA)
Bishop (UT)	Griffith (VA)	Myrick
Black	Grimm	Neugebauer
Blackburn	Guinta	Noem
Bonner	Guthrie	Nugent
Boustany	Hall	Nunes
Brady (TX)	Hanna	Nunnelee
Brooks	Harper	Olson
Broun (GA)	Harris	Palazzo
Buchanan	Hartzler	Paulsen
Bucshon	Hastings (WA)	Pearce
Buerkle	Hayworth	Pence
Burgess	Heck	Petri
Burton (IN)	Heinrich	Pitts
Calvert	Hensarling	Platts
Camp	Herger	Poe (TX)
Campbell	Herrera Beutler	Pompeo
Canseco	Huelskamp	Posey
Cantor	Huizenga (MI)	Price (GA)
Capito	Hultgren	Quayle
Carter	Hunter	Reed
Cassidy	Hurt	Rehberg
Chabot	Issa	Reichert
Chaffetz	Jenkins	Renacci
Coble	Johnson (IL)	Ribble
Coffman (CO)	Johnson (OH)	Rigell
Cole	Johnson, Sam	Rivera
Conaway	Jones	Roby
Cravaack	Jordan	Roe (TN)
Crawford	Kelly	Rogers (AL)
Crenshaw	King (IA)	Rogers (KY)
Culberson	King (NY)	Rogers (MI)
Davis (KY)	Kingston	Rohrabacher
Denham	Kissell	Rokita
Dent	Kline	Rooney
DesJarlais	Labrador	Ros-Lehtinen
Diaz-Balart	Lamborn	Roskam
Dreier	Lance	Ross (FL)
Duffy	Landry	Royce
Duncan (SC)	Lankford	Runyan
Duncan (TN)	Latham	Ryan (WI)
Ellmers	LaTourette	Scalise
Emerson	Latta	Schilling
Farenthold	LoBiondo	Schmidt
Fincher	Long	Schweikert
Fitzpatrick	Lucas	Scott (SC)
Flake	Luetkemeyer	Scott, Austin
Fleischmann	Lummis	Sensenbrenner
Fleming	Lungren, Daniel	Shimkus
Flores	E.	Shuster
Forbes	Mack	Simpson
Fortenberry	Marchant	Smith (NE)
Foxx	Matheson	Smith (NJ)
Franks (AZ)	McCarthy (CA)	Smith (TX)

Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton

Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clever
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr

Akin
Bachus
Baldwin
Bono Mack
Brown (FL)
Davis (IL)
Doggett
Dold
Gonzalez
Jackson (IL)

Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield

NAYS—170

Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Higgins
Himes
Hinche
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Jackson Lee
(TX)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kucinich
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Loeb sack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lujan
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Oliver

NOT VOTING—29

Johnson (GA)
Kinzinger (IL)
Langevin
Lee (CA)
Lewis (CA)
Lipinski
Manzullo
Marino
Meehan
Paul

Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

Owens
Pallone
Pascarelli
Pastor (AZ)
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Holden
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey

EXCESS FEDERAL BUILDING AND PROPERTY DISPOSAL ACT OF 2012

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GARDNER). The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 665), to establish a pilot program for the expedited disposal of federal real property, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 403, nays 0, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 114]

YEAS—403

Ackerman	Clay	Gingrey (GA)
Adams	Cleaver	Gohmert
Aderholt	Clyburn	Goodlatte
Alexander	Coble	Gosar
Altmire	Coffman (CO)	Gowdy
Amash	Cohen	Granger
Amodei	Cole	Graves (GA)
Andrews	Conaway	Graves (MO)
Austria	Connolly (VA)	Green, Al
Baca	Conyers	Green, Gene
Bachmann	Cooper	Griffin (AR)
Baldwin	Costa	Griffith (VA)
Barletta	Costello	Grijalva
Barrow	Courtney	Grimm
Bartlett	Cravaack	Guinta
Barton (TX)	Crawford	Guthrie
Bass (CA)	Crenshaw	Gutierrez
Bass (NH)	Critz	Hahn
Becerra	Crowley	Hall
Benishek	Cuellar	Hanabusa
Berg	Culberson	Hanna
Berkley	Cummings	Harper
Berman	Davis (CA)	Harris
Biggert	Davis (KY)	Hartzler
Bilbray	DeFazio	Hastings (FL)
Bilirakis	DeGette	Hastings (WA)
Bishop (GA)	DeLauro	Hayworth
Bishop (NY)	Denham	Heck
Bishop (UT)	Dent	Heinrich
Black	DesJarlais	Hensarling
Blackburn	Deutch	Herger
Blumenauer	Diaz-Balart	Herrera Beutler
Bonamici	Dicks	Higgins
Bonner	Dingell	Himes
Boren	Donnelly (IN)	Hinche
Boswell	Doyle	Hinojosa
Boustany	Dreier	Hirono
Brady (PA)	Duffy	Hochul
Brady (TX)	Duncan (SC)	Holden
Braley (IA)	Duncan (TN)	Holt
Brooks	Edwards	Honda
Broun (GA)	Ellison	Hoyer
Brown (FL)	Ellmers	Huelskamp
Buchanan	Emerson	Huizenga (MI)
Bucshon	Engel	Hultgren
Buerkle	Eshoo	Hunter
Burgess	Farenthold	Hurt
Burton (IN)	Farr	Israel
Butterfield	Fattah	Issa
Calvert	Filner	Jackson Lee
Camp	Fincher	(TX)
Campbell	Fitzpatrick	Jenkins
Canseco	Flake	Johnson (IL)
Cantor	Fleischmann	Johnson (OH)
Capito	Fleming	Johnson, E. B.
Capps	Flores	Johnson, Sam
Capuano	Forbes	Jones
Cardoza	Fortenberry	Jordan
Carnahan	Foxx	Kaptur
Carney	Frank (MA)	Keating
Carson (IN)	Franks (AZ)	Kelly
Carter	Frelinghuysen	Kildee
Cassidy	Fudge	Kind
Castor (FL)	Gallegly	King (IA)
Chabot	Garamendi	King (NY)
Chaffetz	Gardner	Kingston
Chu	Garrett	Kissell
Cicilline	Gerlach	Kline
Clarke (MI)	Gibbs	Kucinich
Clarke (NY)	Gibson	Labrador

□ 1517

Mr. LUJÁN, Ms. HAHN, and Mr. HONDA changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. BRADY of Texas changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Lamborn	Olver	Schweikert
Lance	Owens	Scott (SC)
Landry	Palazzo	Scott (VA)
Langevin	Pallone	Scott, Austin
Lankford	Pascarell	Scott, David
Larsen (WA)	Pastor (AZ)	Sensenbrenner
Larson (CT)	Paulsen	Serrano
Latham	Pearce	Sewell
LaTourette	Pelosi	Sherman
Latta	Pence	Shimkus
Levin	Perlmutter	Shuler
Lewis (GA)	Peters	Shuster
LoBiondo	Peterson	Simpson
Loeback	Petri	Sires
Lofgren, Zoe	Pingree (ME)	Slaughter
Long	Pitts	Smith (NE)
Lowey	Platts	Smith (NJ)
Lucas	Poe (TX)	Smith (TX)
Luetkemeyer	Polis	Smith (WA)
Luján	Pompeo	Southerland
Lummis	Possey	Speier
Lungren, Daniel E.	Price (GA)	Stark
	Price (NC)	Stearns
Lynch	Quayle	Stivers
Mack	Quigley	Stutzman
Maloney	Rahall	Sullivan
Marchant	Reed	Sutton
Matheson	Rehberg	Terry
Matsui	Reichert	Thompson (CA)
McCarthy (CA)	Renacci	Thompson (MS)
McCarthy (NY)	Reyes	Thompson (PA)
McCaul	Ribble	Thornberry
McClintock	Richardson	Tiberi
McCollum	Richmond	Tierney
McCotter	Rigell	Tipton
McDermott	Rivera	Tonko
McGovern	Roby	Towns
McHenry	Roe (TN)	Tsongas
McIntyre	Rogers (AL)	Turner (NY)
McKeon	Rogers (KY)	Turner (OH)
McKinley	Rogers (MI)	Upton
McMorris	Rohrabacher	Visclosky
	Rokita	Walberg
Rodgers	Rooney	Walden
McNerney	Rothman (NJ)	Walz (MN)
Meeks	Roybal-Allard	Wasserman
Mica	Royce	Wasserman
Michaud	Runyan	Schultz
Miller (FL)	Ruppersberger	Waters
Miller (MI)	Ryan (OH)	Watt
Miller (NC)	Ryan (WI)	Waxman
Miller, George	Sánchez, Linda T.	Webster
Moore	Sánchez, Loretta	Welch
Moran	Sarbanes	West
Mulvaney	Scalise	Westmoreland
Murphy (CT)	Schakowsky	Whitfield
Murphy (PA)	Schiff	Wilson (FL)
Myrick	Schilling	Wilson (SC)
	Schmidt	Wittman
Nadler	Schrader	Wolf
Napolitano	Schwartz	Womack
Neal		Woodall
Neugebauer		Woolsey
Noem		Yoder
Nugent		Young (AK)
Nunes		Young (FL)
Nunnelee		Young (IN)
Olson		

NOT VOTING—28

Akin	Kinzinger (IL)	Rangel
Bachus	Lee (CA)	Rush
Bono Mack	Lewis (CA)	Schock
Chandler	Lipinski	Sessions
Davis (IL)	Manzullo	Van Hollen
Doggett	Marino	Velázquez
Dold	Markey	Walsh (IL)
Gonzalez	Meehan	Yarmuth
Jackson (IL)	Miller, Gary	
Johnson (GA)	Paul	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1526

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. AKIN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall Nos. 113 and 114, I was delayed and unable to vote. Had I been present I would have voted "yea" on both.

RESIGNATIONS AS MEMBERS OF COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WEST) laid before the House the following resignations as members of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
WASHINGTON, DC,
March 20, 2012.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER: In order to rejoin the Committee on Energy and Commerce, I hereby resign my seat on the Science, Space, and Technology Committee and the Natural Resources Committee, effective today.

Sincerely,

JOHN P. SARBANES,
Member of Congress.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
WASHINGTON, DC,
March 20, 2012.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Please accept my resignation from the House Committee on Science, Space, and Technology (SST), effective immediately. I have been pleased to serve on the SST Committee during the 112th Congress. However, this resignation is necessitated by the recent vacancy on, and my assignment to, the House Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Thank you.

Best Regards,

MARCIA L. FUDGE,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignations are accepted.

There was no objection.

ELECTING MEMBERS TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Democratic Caucus, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 590

Resolved, That the following named Members be and are hereby elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

(1) COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE.—Ms. Fudge.

(2) COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE.—Mr. Sarbanes.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVING RESTRICTIONS FOR ACCOMACK COUNTY LAND PARCEL

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill, H.R. 2087.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 587 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2087.

□ 1529

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2087) to remove restrictions from a parcel of land situated in the Atlantic District, Accomack County, Virginia, with Mr. GARDNER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of H.R. 2087, an authentic, no-cost jobs bill aimed at removing government hurdles to economic development.

This bill by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. RIGELL) would allow Accomack County in Virginia to move forward with plans to develop—and, Mr. Chairman, I want to say this very explicitly—not 32 million, not 320,000, not 320—a 32-acre parcel of land adjacent to a NASA airstrip into a technology and research facility.

Currently, the parcel has a restriction limiting use of the property to recreational purposes. This was a condition placed on the property when the county obtained the deed through the Federal Land to Park program in 1976. Unfortunately, the park has been of little benefit to the community. Though the county has made diligent efforts, the park has fallen out of use and is currently overgrown and unmaintained.

Now Accomack County has found a better way to serve its citizens, and has determined that with this legislation they can create hundreds of short-term and long-term jobs.

□ 1530

Mr. Chairman, again, this property is already owned by Accomack County, not the Federal Government. Congress created the program that allowed the county to take title to this land. The

purpose at that time was to help communities like this do exactly what the bill says it should do. Congress has the authority to do this, and it should have the common sense to allow the county to do this.

But there have been concerns raised that this bill would create a precedent leading to an avalanche of these types of requests. Let's be clear: This is simply one specific proposal dealing with one parcel of land totaling 32 acres—not 32,000, not 320 million, just 32 acres.

To put this into perspective, there are nearly 170,000 acres of land that have been transferred to State and local governments through the Federal Lands to Park program. Nothing in this bill would affect those other acres. This bill is narrowly focused, involves an extremely small area of land, and, frankly, it's unfortunate that this bill is even before us today.

However, I will state that there absolutely are instances in which communities and States would be better off if the Federal red tape on private land ownership was lifted, just as there are instances where reducing Federal land-ownership would be beneficial to local communities and States. Yet here we are debating this specific bill, and it is simply not reasonable to argue that the sky is going to fall if this bill affecting, again, Mr. Chairman, just 32 acres in Accomack County becomes law.

With unemployment still over 8 percent, Congress should be looking for every opportunity possible, no matter how big or how small, to create new American jobs. Gas prices are rapidly rising and families and businesses are struggling to make ends meet. Now more than ever, Congress should make it a priority to eliminate hurdles to economic development; and, Mr. Chairman, that's exactly what this bill does.

The gentleman from Virginia has given us an opportunity to immediately help a community with a plan to create jobs. We need to pass this legislation today, and I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2087.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the legislation.

The Federal Lands to Parks program is one of the most successful parts of our National Park Service. For those parts of the country that are not blessed with the Grand Canyon or Sonoran Desert, this program provides local government with excess Federal lands at no cost, provided the land is used for recreational purposes.

Over the years, nearly 1,500 parcels of land have gone to local governments for free but with deeds that ensure they are used for the public good. This land isn't foisted upon these local governments. Instead, local governments actively work with the Park Service to obtain land for "historical, natural, or recreational interest."

I should note for clarification, as we go forward with this debate, that this is not county land. This is Federal land. The county is allowed to control this land as long as it is used for the recreational purposes in the agreement. If this were county land, we would not be here. The county can't sell the land. The county can't lease the land. The county does not own the land. This bill gives Federal land away for free.

Examples of successful projects include: 195 acres that went to the City of Ogden, Utah, for the Ogden Nature Center, Rodeo, and Fairgrounds; 97 acres that went to Brigham City, Utah, for the Brigham Intermountain Golf Course; 103 acres to the County of Walla Walla, Washington, for the Fort Walla Walla Park; 307 acres to the City of Aurora, Colorado, for the Aurora Reservoir Park; and 2.57 acres to the Town of Hot Sulfur Springs, Colorado. All of these entities took the same deal as Accomack County in 1976. They expressed their desire for the land, advocated for the transfer, and freely agreed to a deed that ensured that the land would be used for recreation or revert back to Federal ownership.

Over the years, as local governments have fought development pressures and budget shortfalls, the Park Service and the General Services Administration have developed a land exchange process to enable some flexibility for communities. They can enter into a land exchange that requires the replacement land be of equal recreation and fair market value. Alternatively, the county can return the land to the Federal Government and purchase it for fair market value through the GSA process. The sponsor of the legislation and the county involved have rejected both of these options. Instead, the county is actively promoting a development plan that includes these lands in question while waiting for an act of Congress to clear the deed.

The enactment of this bill creates an unacceptable and dangerous precedent for every other project out there.

The reason the Federal land management agencies refuse to give away Federal land is because Congress requires the agencies to seek legislation to sell or transfer Federal land. Do you know why? Because a pesky little document called the United States Constitution requires Congress to make laws with respect to the disposition of Federal land. This would encourage local governments to run to Congress and cash in on a gift the Federal Government shared with local communities.

This legislation should be rejected. I urge a "no" vote on this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 5 minutes to the author of this legislation, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. RIGELL).

Mr. RIGELL. I thank my friend, the gentleman from Washington.

I appreciate the opportunity, Mr. Chairman, to come before this body today and make the case that this is wonderful and strong legislation that should be moved forward for one purpose: job creation in the Commonwealth of Virginia and, specifically, in Accomack County.

It, indeed, is a jobs bill. It reflects common sense. It reflects common ground. It came out of committee with bipartisan support. And I think most importantly, Mr. Chairman, it reflects the collective wisdom and the will of the hardworking taxpayers of Accomack County.

Here is why, Mr. Chairman, this bill, if passed and enacted, will create jobs: You see, the folks of Accomack County have not asked the Federal Government for something. They've simply asked the Federal Government to get out of the way so that the greatest job-producing engine the world has ever known, the American entrepreneurs, and Accomack County can get to work in a very responsible way of developing this property that is immediately adjacent to the Wallops NASA facility there.

It is, I think, a clear contrast of two basic philosophical approaches to job creation. One looks to this institution and to Washington to see that this institution is the primary driver of job creation. As a lifetime entrepreneur, Mr. Chairman, I reject that approach and, instead, have adopted all of my life and believe we need to bring to this body the mindset that the best thing to do to get our economy going again is to eliminate the hurdles. This is a very practical hurdle that is holding back job creation in a county that desperately needs jobs.

Mr. Chairman, 16 percent of the hardworking families in Accomack County live under the poverty line. About 90 percent of the property that's in Accomack County is agricultural.

□ 1540

It is without a doubt a poor county, and this bill simply removes a deed restriction. My friend behind me just a few moments ago said, Do you have a picture of this? I said, Well, we didn't bring it down to the floor, but we could have. It's just overgrown. There's nothing there. There's a dilapidated dugout facility, and that's it. There's no parking, there's no infrastructure, there's no buildings.

Accomack County has a plan. Americans are resourceful. They'll figure their way out of this in spite of Washington. The board of supervisors has a wonderful plan for the Wallops Research Park; but it only works, Mr. Chairman, if this deed restriction is removed. Thirty-two acres. Great potential for the folks in Accomack County.

I want to close, Mr. Chairman, by recounting a conversation that I had just a few moments ago. I actually called the person back. I wanted to make sure I had her permission to share this story. I trust she's listening now.

Mr. Chairman, her name is Kathy Wert. Her husband is a builder in Accomack County, and their business has been hurting because of the economy. Jim's a friend of mine, and I know his business is hurting. Kathy used to work for him in accounting. She's been out looking for work because the construction business is so depressed. And we all know that. I called Kathy and said, I would like to reference you here. Do I have your permission? And she said, Yes, you do.

This is just one family. There are hundreds and hundreds of families in Accomack County. I wish my colleagues on the other side who are opposing this bill could look them in the eye and explain to them why we can't remove this deed restriction. It's a classic example, Mr. Chairman, of a paternalistic Federal Government, an oppressive Federal Government, holding back job creation.

We're all American taxpayers. This idea of transferring it from one to another, \$800,000 or more from a poor county, this is what is wrong with America, Mr. Chairman. Even though this is a relatively small bill in the big scheme of things—32 acres—when the Federal Government owns almost one-third of all the land in the United States, that, too, is a problem. Maybe we'll get around to that one day, Mr. Chairman; but until then we're just talking about 32 acres.

So I would ask my colleagues on the other side to reconsider, and I would ask them to vote in favor of this, and let's get some hardworking folks in Accomack County back to work.

Mr. GRIJALVA. I yield 5 minutes to the gentlelady from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, it's inconceivable to me that with all the challenges we have that are facing our Nation, this body is taking up legislation today having to do with a 32-acre parcel of land in Virginia. Is this really the best we can do at a moment when our economy is still underperforming? At a moment when we're still sending brave Americans to die in an immoral war that's gone on for nearly as long as my grandson Teddy has been alive?

We still have more than 8 percent unemployment in this country. We still have families and entire communities wondering what happened to the American Dream. We have people losing their home through no fault of their own. We have people wondering how they're going to pay next month's bills, never mind the daunting cost of sending their child to college. We have families wondering why the very health care reforms they needed are about to go on trial at the U.S. Supreme Court. We also have people who, more than ever, are depending on safety-net programs like Medicare and Medicaid, which have a big fat target on their backs put on by the Republican budget plan that was just unveiled today.

A good start would be to pass the Senate transportation bill to rebuild

our infrastructure and put our people back to work. And then, how about getting down to the business of ending the war in Afghanistan, which is killing our people, undermining our national security, and diverting the money that we need to meet human needs right here at home. I can't believe that the American people want us to debate a bill about 32 acres of land in Virginia—not when we still have thousands of troops in harm's way, fighting a war that is doing nothing to keep America safe and nothing to protect our vital interests.

We have important issues to debate, Mr. Chairman, big problems to tackle, Americans who need our help, and an overseas conflict that must end. This is a moment of great urgency. Why isn't the majority acting like it?

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the cosponsor of this legislation, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HARRIS).

Mr. HARRIS. I want to thank the chairman of the committee for giving me the opportunity to speak and the gentleman from Virginia for giving me the opportunity to cosponsor this bill. The gentleman from Virginia, of course, is from the southern end of the Delmarva Peninsula. I represent the middle part adjoining Accomack County.

We heard a lot during the State of the Union Address. The President stood just a few feet in front of you, Mr. Chairman, and talked about shovel-ready jobs and infrastructure. Mr. Chairman, there are shovel-ready jobs ready to go. This land adjoins Wallops Island, the launch facility which now is one of the places that launched private and public vehicles into space. It doesn't get any better than that for a poor county like Accomack.

The chairman of the committee mentioned an 8 percent unemployment rate. Well, Mr. Chairman, I wish that Worcester County, where half the employees in this industrial park will work, had an 8 percent rate. The unemployment rate was 15.6 percent in Worcester County.

The President stood there and said, We've got to get Americans back to work. Mr. Chairman, we need to cut through the red tape, just like the President said, and get projects like this going. There's no loss of recreation area. Accomack County has offered to, in fact, find another 32 areas to have the recreation area. So let's not pretend there's a loss. Let's not pretend this land doesn't belong to Accomack County. They hold the title. Like a poor stepchild they are coming to Uncle Sam begging for permission to create some jobs in Accomack County. And like the mean old uncle, Uncle Sam has said, No. There's red tape involved. We have a bureaucracy. You have to fill in all the blanks. You have to do this. Mr. Chairman, the 15.6 percent of Worcester County who are unemployed don't have the time for this red tape. We must do it.

The gentleman called this unacceptable and dangerous. Mr. Chairman, you're right, 15.6 percent unemployment is unacceptable. It's dangerous to our economy. The gentlelady said it's inconceivable that we're here. I couldn't have said it better. How could our Federal bureaucracy have failed so poorly?

We need to pass this bill, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GRIJALVA. I yield 4 minutes to my colleague from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON).

Mr. ELLISON. I would like to thank the gentleman for yielding time.

I have no doubt that these issues are important to the people involved. I have no doubt that the people who support and oppose this bill care deeply about it. It's a local issue, and I come from a locality and therefore understand. But the fact of the matter is that our country is in some seriously grievous harm because, yes, we do have an exorbitant unemployment rate. It's been going down. We've been adding private sector jobs. But there's still too many people unemployed. And yet the majority has not taken the time on the floor today to deal with how we're going to get all Americans back to work. They're taking time to figure out how they're going to do an earmark after they've said there's no earmarks.

This is remarkable. I'm actually not against earmarks, Mr. Chairman. I'm for them—I think they're a good thing—but the majority has said no earmarks. Yet this is about the second time in the last couple of weeks we see them floating their earmarks right on through.

H.R. 2087 would allow a county in a particular Representative's district to acquire full ownership of a little less than 32 acres of Federal land worth more than \$800,000 for free. That's an earmark. Yet the rest of us can't get them. But if you are among the favorite few, you can. That's wrong. That's unfair. That's unjust. And it's particularly unjust, given the grievous problems that we're facing as a Nation.

We should be voting on a real jobs bill to create good jobs all across America, but apparently that's not what we're going to be doing with our time today. We're going to be talking about a narrow provincial interest and trying to give away Federal land for free for a particular interest in a particular locality. We should be talking about how we're going to save and protect Medicare guaranteed for all Americans, which is a threat, given the Ryan budget. But, no, we're talking about a narrow, small-town interest, which I think is important but that the majority in their infinite wisdom has said we can't do because that's an earmark.

The GOP has wasted the last 441 days that they've been in charge, and has failed to produce a single jobs bill.

□ 1550

In fact, they're trying to cut jobs. The transportation bill would lead to

losses of over 500,000 jobs. Now, I definitely sympathize with the folks who are out of work in the Member's district, I mean in the county where this earmark is going to be taking place. I do. I'm very concerned about the unemployed. That's why I wish we had a real jobs bill as opposed to these giveaways of Federal land, and we really don't know who it's going to be benefiting at the end of the day.

The bottom line is we have real problems in America. We've got transportation needs, we've got environmental needs, and we've got health care needs. We've got real debate to take care of. But if we're going to be debating those things, we've got to be on the floor, taking the time up to do those things, not dealing with disguised earmarks for certain people because they happen to—I don't know. I don't know why they get privileged treatment over people like me who don't get to offer earmarks anymore.

I'll say this, Mr. Chairman: at the end of the day, America is a country that needs the attention of this Congress so that everybody can get a job that pays well across this country. And we're not doing that. We're failing. What we're doing is we're allowing one county in one Member's district to acquire the full ownership of a valuable piece of land for free. And that's wrong.

Mr. GRIJALVA. I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Washington, Congressman McDERMOTT.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Chairman, when we came into this session, there was a lot of talk in this House about the fact that we needed jobs, lots and lots of talk on the other side about how they were going to take care of this economy and we were going to finally get some jobs. There hasn't been one single bill put out here in 441 days. We are still waiting for a jobs bill from the Republican leadership.

Now, I don't want to dismiss the piece of legislation we're discussing here. I'm sure it's very important to have 32 acres of Virginia, and perhaps maybe there will be 100 jobs there. Those are important jobs for those people. We are in favor of that.

What's hard to understand is the Republicans' idea of priorities. Mr. Chairman, I can't understand how the Republican leadership could let the highway bill expire in 11 days and end highway construction in the United States of America and bring out instead a bill for 32 acres in rural Virginia that—most of us would have a tough time finding Accomack County on a map. There are 550,000 people working on rebuilding infrastructure in this country in the highway system, and the Republican leadership won't bring it out because they've got a fight inside. They've got a fight inside. They've got a bill that is so bad that it bankrupts the highway trust in 2016 and creates a \$78 billion funding shortfall over the next 10 years. That's the highway bill that they won't bring out here. I understand why they won't bring it out here.

They'd get chewed up by the fiscal irresponsibility.

They have a bill sitting on the desk from the Senate they could bring up tomorrow, and we could ensure construction jobs all over this country for 550,000 people. But no, we're out here with this little—the last speaker said, it's really interesting, all the jumping, shouting, and waving of arms, we're not going to have any more earmarks in the House of Representatives. Earmarks are evil. They're evil things created by the devil, and we have wiped them out.

Now, if this ain't an earmark, I don't know what is. If you put a bill out here for 32 acres in two Members' districts, that's an earmark, folks. That's an earmark. And I'm not saying earmarks are bad. Frankly, I went to three of them last weekend in my district. One was the restoration of the King Street Station in the railroad system. Another one was an addition to the Wing Luke Museum, which is a national monument. These kinds of things make sense, and I think this piece of legislation makes sense, and it will probably go out of here without a single vote against it.

But it can't go out without somebody saying, where are your priorities? Where are they? Why is it that the leadership of the Republicans can't get their people in line to get a highway bill out here when it's 11 days from the day it expires? What is the matter? Well, I think really what it is, it's driven by the ideology that is creating most of the problems in this 2 years in terms of recovery. Nobody wants to give President Obama one single success, and they will kill the highway department and the highway construction fund and everything else if they can just make sure they don't reelect President Obama. That's what it's all about. It's very clear.

We see it going on tomorrow. It begins over across the street in the Supreme Court. They've spent 3½ years fighting providing health care for all Americans—3½ years fighting it, not trying to improve it, not trying to make it work better, but trying to repeal it. That's what's going on in this city. In fact, thousands of people have got health care now that didn't have it. The fact that you can now keep your kids on your policy to the age of 26 has added millions of young people to those who are insured against health problems. There are people who have health care in spite of the fact that they have a preexisting condition.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GRIJALVA. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. McDERMOTT. They've got their health insurance because the bill that the President got through the Congress with our help was one that made it possible for you to get insurance if you have a preexisting condition. Now there are thousands of people who have benefited from that in this country,

but not one single attempt has been made by the Republicans in 3½ years to do anything to make that work better. All they want to do is destroy it.

This is the party of destruction—the destruction of the infrastructure of the country, the destruction of an attempt to do the health care. You can go right down the list—441 days, no jobs bill—and what we get out here is this earmark. It would really be kind of laughable if it weren't so serious.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I advise my friend that I have no requests for time. If he is prepared to close, I'll close.

Mr. GRIJALVA. I am prepared to close.

Mr. Chairman, as we have heard continually from my friends on the other side of the aisle, before us we have a seemingly innocent piece of legislation that would allow Accomack County to develop a mere 32 acres of land for an aerospace park. One might even wonder why we are taking up valuable time on the House floor in debating this measure.

This is not innocent legislation. This is a Federal land giveaway that under any other circumstance would be considered an earmark. It is also the opening shot of a larger effort on the part of the Republicans to privatize our Federal lands. In 1976, Accomack County made a deal. They received 32 acres of Federal property free of charge. In return, they promised to use the land for public recreation purposes. Now they want a different deal, only they don't want to pay for it. The deal they want is to commercially develop the land they got for free and relocate the displaced recreation activity to a former landfill.

While it is “just” 32 acres, it represents what appears to be the Republican platform: that our parks, forests, and wildlife areas are cash cows, assets to sell and develop during these tough economic times.

□ 1600

Presidential candidate Mitt Romney told a Nevada newspaper that he doesn't know what the purpose is of public lands. While in Idaho, Presidential candidate Rick Santorum told the crowd that public lands in Idaho should go back to the hands of the private sector. This theme is not new. In 2005, then-chairman of the House Committee on Natural Resources, Richard Pombo, proposed selling national parks to mining companies.

Today, part of the Ryan budget was released. Again, it is proposing to sell off 3.3 million acres of public land. Most recently, an Energy and Commerce subcommittee chairman suggested selling off some of our national parks. We can't get through a meeting of the House Committee on Natural Resources without someone from the majority suggesting that lands need to be transferred to the States, or sold, or fully developed for gas and oil.

My view, and the view of most Americans, is completely different. As renowned documentary filmmaker Ken

Burns put it, our National Park System is America's best idea. Our forests and desert lands represent what is the best in America—a long-term view that we should protect and value the majesty that God has blessed our Nation with for this generation and the generations to come.

I urge my colleagues to join with me to defeat this legislation. We need this Congress to affirm to the American people that we value our parks, our forests, and wildlife areas for their inherent value. We value them as places to recreate with our family. We value them as places to hunt and fish. Sometimes we value them for just knowing that they are there, in hopes that one day we can visit.

I urge a “no” vote, a vote to protect our public lands from this precedent that is being set by H.R. 2087.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the rhetoric on the other side of the aisle on the debate on this issue is rather interesting. Let me take a couple of the issues that were brought up and try to address them.

First, the issue of an earmark. Now, just to remind our body—we must have a very short attention span—but this House acted not too long ago on the question of earmarks and said we should proceed. That's why we are debating this bill. Why? Because H.R. 2087 does not contain an earmark. It is in full compliance with the earmark definition provided for in House rule 21 in the earmark ban that was instituted by the House Republicans in January of 2011.

Why is that or how is that? Because the House definition of an earmark requires that there be spending in some form directed to an entity. In H.R. 2087, we do not direct any spending of any money in any form. It has no fiscal impact. So, Mr. Chairman, to repeat once again—we had this debate earlier, and the House confirmed that debate, by the way—there is no earmark in this bill. Let me make a couple other observations of the previous speakers that have spoken.

One of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle came down here and said it's been X number of days—I forget how many he said—without one job bill. Well, he's right, Mr. Chairman. There is not just one job bill. There are a multitude of job bills that have been addressed by this body, generally on a bipartisan basis. I might add, if you go back just prior to our last district work period, we passed some bills, which were a series of bills that had passed with bipartisan support, over to the Senate. I'd advise my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, rather than talking here about a lack of activity, go talk to your colleagues on the other side of the Rotunda over there and say: Move these jobs bills. That's what we ought to be doing.

Furthermore, if there are two big issues that the American people are confronted with today, it's jobs and energy. Way last year, we passed energy bills that created American jobs. Don't come down to the floor and say we have not addressed energy jobs. This House has done its work, generally with bipartisan support, but I will note that those that spoke on that voted “no.” I don't know what they want to do—create government jobs? Is that the idea?

So, Mr. Chairman, I just want to point out that, I guess in rhetoric and debate on the floor, you get all sorts of different takes, but the facts are the House has passed job-creating bills. They have passed energy job-creating bills. This bill here potentially falls in line with that. I urge my colleagues to support it.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources printed in the bill shall be considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule and shall be considered read.

The text of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 2087

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. REMOVAL OF RESTRICTIONS.

(a) REMOVAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall execute such instruments as may be necessary to remove all deed restrictions described in subsection (b) relating to the parcel of land described in subsection (c).

(b) DEED RESTRICTIONS.—The deed restrictions referred to in subsection (a) are those restrictions, including easements, exceptions, reservations, terms, conditions, and covenants described in Quitclaim Deed No. 17808A from the United States to Accomack County, Virginia, executed on December 20, 1976, and recorded among the real estate records of Accomack County, Virginia, by the Clerk of the Circuit Court, on pages 292 through 296 of Deed Book 381.

(c) DESCRIPTION OF LAND.—The parcel of land referred to in subsection (a) consists of approximately 31.6 acres situated in the Atlantic District, Accomack County, Virginia, more particularly described in the metes and bounds description recorded on page 292 of the quitclaim deed described in subsection (b).

The CHAIR. No amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 19, 2012, and except pro forma amendments for the purpose of debate. Each amendment so printed may be offered only by the Member who caused it to be printed or a designee and shall be considered read.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. GRIJALVA

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. LUCAS). The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

(d) CONSIDERATION.—Any instrument executed pursuant to subsection (a), shall provide that—

(1) in consideration for the land described in subsection (c), Accomack County, Virginia, shall pay the United States the fair market value of the land (on the date of the enactment of this Act) under terms approved by the Secretary of the Interior from revenues generated by the sale, rent, or lease of the land; and

(2) the land described in subsection (c) shall be appraised in accordance with nationally recognized appraisal standards (including the Uniform Appraisal Standards for Federal Land Acquisitions and the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice) by an independent appraiser selected by the Secretary of the Interior and Accomack County, Virginia.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona for 5 minutes.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of my amendment to H.R. 2087.

This is a very simple amendment. It ensures that Federal taxpayers are compensated for the land that is moving out of public ownership and into private development.

The Federal Land to Parks program provides Federal land to local governments with the agreement through the deed that the lands will stay in public use, primarily for recreation.

Accomack County, Virginia, is actively marketing the development of the land in question to the aerospace industry for hangars and other types of commercial development. The land is valued at over \$800,000. Meanwhile, the county is asking Congress to intervene so they can take the land they got for free and develop it without compensating the Federal Government.

The underlying bill is the legislative equivalent of writing Accomack County a check for \$815,000. It is only because this is cloaked through a deed amendment that it isn't called an “earmark.”

My amendment simply requires the county to repay the Federal Government for the fair market value of the lands from the proceeds of the development.

By ensuring the taxpayer is protected, we also send a signal to other local governments that are facing economic or development pressures that their parks, developed through the Federal Lands to Parks program, are not piggy banks to tap into when times get tough.

I understand the challenges that Accomack County faces, but they want this land to not necessarily put unemployed people back to work; they want this land to attract the lucrative aerospace industry to the Eastern Shore, not to build a job-training facility.

I urge support for the amendment. It assures that the taxpayer is protected.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona does not help Accomack County create jobs, and that is the underlying purpose of this bill.

Recall that this property was obtained by Accomack County because the Federal Government did not need it or want it anymore. The Federal Government washed their hands of this land. Indeed, there was a deed restriction, but the underlying intent was to benefit the citizens of Accomack County. Today, we are acting again to help those same citizens by allowing them to use the property as they see appropriate.

This deed restriction was put in place 36 years ago, and it no longer serves as a benefit to the county. Just because we could demand that they give the land back to the Federal Government does not mean that we should do it, and demanding that they buy the land they already own makes even less sense. In the same vein in which Accomack County requested this land in 1976, they're back asking us again to help their citizens.

I understand the gentleman is looking out for the Federal Government—and I respect that—out of fear that somehow a small county in rural Virginia might take advantage of it. But I do want to assure my good friend from Arizona that the Federal Government and its countless millions of acres of land can and will go on without these 32 acres.

□ 1610

We hear time and again how grateful we should be for massive Federal ownership in the West and of the bounty of tourist dollars it produces. Now, in this very narrow example of 32 acres, perhaps you will see the blessing of local control and what you can do without Washington's central planning and land management.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment because it is unwarranted and does nothing to produce much needed jobs.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS
OF FLORIDA

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk, and it is preprinted.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill add the following:

(d) VALUATION OF LAND.—Any instrument executed pursuant to subsection (a) shall provide that, before the restrictions referred to in this Act are removed from the deed referred to in this Act, an independent appraiser shall complete an approximate valuation of the land in each of the following years: 1776 1865, 2013, 2017, 2032, and 2212.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I'd like to preface my remarks by indicating, at the close of my remarks and when the debate is concluded on this amendment, I do not intend to call for a vote, largely for the reason that I believe that the ranking member, Mr. GRIJALVA's amendment covers much of what I have offered in this amendment; and second, out of respect for my colleague from Accomack, Mr. RIGELL, who I believe has brought this matter, as many of us may be wont to do in the future, regarding the economic concerns that exist in his community.

I would only add, he cited to 16 percent unemployment earlier today in his presentation on the floor. I could take him to some places in the congressional district that I'm privileged to serve and show him 40 percent unemployment in a rural area that happens to be in the same contiguous area as the Everglades National Park. And I'm sure that I could come back here and offer some measures that would allow for Belle Glade and Clewiston and South Bay and Canal Point to have an opportunity to convert land that is in a national park that was given for that purpose, to leave the reversionary restriction aside and to go about the business of allowing for those counties, Hendry and Palm Beach County and Broward, to be able to utilize the land as they see fit.

Land has a market value at some point. As I understand it—and I stand to be corrected certainly by my good friend and colleague from Washington—the original deed in this property allowed that if the parcel was no longer used for recreational purposes that it would revert to the Federal Government. Well, clearly, that reversionary clause is what we are seeking in this particular measure, in this specific one, to overturn. I believe it's wholly unnecessary but, more importantly, I think it sets a bad precedent of involving Congress in consensually entered agreements.

As I've explained, the county was granted the land on the condition that it be used as a park. And I understand, and understood further, from my good friend Mr. HASTINGS' comments yesterday at the Rules Committee, that the land can't even be accessed—if it were not Mr. HASTINGS, then it was Mr. BISHOP—and, therefore, it is important that they make this change.

Congress shouldn't grant special treatment of something as erratic as market value because the market value of land is always changing. And all I have to do is look at my mortgage and look at how the prices have gone down, as they have all over this country.

I heard the statement yesterday in the Rules Committee that the land is useless. I don't think any land is useless. Mark Twain said that we ain't going to have much more land, just to paraphrase him. They're not manufacturing it; although, I think Singapore may very well take issue with that comment.

It's a park, and it is important that the Federal Government conditioned the transfer of the land to the county in the first place on the promise that it would be used as a park. The county agreed to those terms when it initially received the land, and now, in all due respect, they want to back out.

It's not unexpected to want to alter an agreement when conditions surrounding the deal change. In fact, if the county no longer wants to use the land as a park, there are remedies readily available within the Federal Lands to Parks program that it could choose from.

Consequently, changing the agreement today because of a shift in market value sets a bad precedent. We don't know what the market value of the land will be a year from now; we don't know what it will be 5 years from now; and we certainly have no idea what it will be 200 years from now. Before you know it, every county and every State—and this is why I feel very strongly about this—will be here, asking Congress for the same special treatment as soon as the market shifts in their favor.

My amendment requires appraisals of the land, and I believe that Mr. GRIJALVA's does as well. All I ask is that if we don't want it to be a park anymore, as the county doesn't, then the county should look to the remedies it already has available to them.

I believe the market value will shift. I hope Mr. RIGELL is successful. I believe the measure will pass.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I would really like to commend my good friend from Florida on his very unique approach to this bill with this very unique amendment. But make no mistake. If it were to pass, the effect would be to hobble and to kill this job-creating bill, so let's set that aside.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment would require appraisals to be conducted in each of the following years: 1776, 1865, 2013, 2017, 2032, and 2212. In this amendment as the amendment is written, these appraisals must be done in those years.

We did not have a Federal Government in 1776, for example. In 1865, Virginia was part of the Confederacy. That means, however, if we have a requirement to have an appraisal in each of these years, that would require that we go back 236 years and into the future 200 years before this legislation would go into effect.

Now, there may be a misconception or maybe a misidentification, I would tell my friend. I am Doc HASTINGS. I am not Doc Brown, the mad scientist from “Back to the Future.” I do not own, nor do I have access to, a plutonium-powered DeLorean that will allow me or Michael J. Fox to complete the complexities of this amendment. I can’t go back 236 years; I can’t go forward 200 years.

So, notwithstanding some new technology, I have to say, Mr. Chairman, in all sincerity, we should defeat this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak for just 15 seconds.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, my good friend, DOC HASTINGS—that is, not Doc Brown—is mindful that we are going to have a future. I just want to comment that there is a future, and we tend to do it around here. As a matter of fact, we do it in budgetary matters; we do it all around.

I appreciate very much my friend pointing out that creativity that I offered. At the very same time, I think Mr. GRIJALVA’s amendment is deserving of serious consideration, and I support it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS).

The amendment was rejected.

□ 1620

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. GRIJALVA

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, the unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 178, noes 226, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 115]

AYES—178

Ackerman	Amash	Baca
Altmire	Andrews	Baldwin

Becerra	Gerlach	Pallone
Berman	Green, Al	Pascarell
Bishop (GA)	Green, Gene	Pastor (AZ)
Bishop (NY)	Grijalva	Pelosi
Blumenauer	Gutierrez	Perlmutter
Bonamici	Hanabusa	Peters
Boren	Hastings (FL)	Peterson
Boswell	Heinrich	Pingree (ME)
Brady (PA)	Higgins	Polis
Braley (IA)	Himes	Price (NC)
Brown (FL)	Hinchey	Quigley
Burton (IN)	Hinojosa	Rahall
Butterfield	Hirono	Reyes
Capps	Hochul	Richardson
Capuano	Holden	Richmond
Cardoza	Holt	Ross (AR)
Carnahan	Honda	Rothman (NJ)
Carney	Hoyer	Roybal-Allard
Carson (IN)	Israel	Ruppersberger
Castor (FL)	Jackson Lee	Ryan (OH)
Chandler	(TX)	Sanchez, Linda
Chu	Johnson (GA)	T.
Cicilline	Johnson, E. B.	Sanchez, Loretta
Clarke (MI)	Keating	Sarbanes
Clarke (NY)	Kildes	Schakowsky
Clay	Kind	Schiff
Cleaver	Kissell	Schrader
Clyburn	Kucinich	Schwartz
Cohen	Langevin	Scott, David
Connolly (VA)	Larsen (WA)	Serrano
Conyers	Larson (CT)	Sewell
Cooper	Levin	Sherman
Costa	Lewis (GA)	Sires
Costello	Loebback	Slaughter
Courtney	Critz	Smith (WA)
Crowley	Loftgren, Zoe	Speier
Cuellar	Lowey	Stark
Cummings	Lujan	Sutton
Davis (CA)	Lynch	Thompson (CA)
DeFazio	Maloney	Thompson (MS)
DeGette	Matheson	Tierney
DeLauro	Matsui	Tonko
Deutch	McCarthy (NY)	Towns
Dicks	McCollum	Tsongas
Dingell	McDermott	Van Hollen
Donnelly (IN)	McGovern	Velazquez
Doyle	McIntyre	Visclosky
Edwards	McNerney	Walz (MN)
Ellison	Meeks	Wasserman
Engel	Miller (NC)	Schultz
Eshoo	Miller, George	Waters
Farr	Moore	Watt
Fattah	Moran	Waxman
Filner	Murphy (CT)	Welch
Fitzpatrick	Nadler	Wilson (FL)
Frank (MA)	Napolitano	Woodall
Fudge	Neal	Woolsey
Garamendi	Oliver	
	Owens	

NOES—226

Adams	Coffman (CO)	Gowdy
Aderholt	Cole	Granger
Alexander	Conaway	Graves (GA)
Amodei	Cravaack	Graves (MO)
Austria	Crawford	Griffin (AR)
Bachmann	Crenshaw	Griffith (VA)
Barletta	Culberson	Grimm
Barrow	Davis (KY)	Guinta
Bartlett	Denham	Guthrie
Barton (TX)	Dent	Hahn
Bass (NH)	DesJarlais	Hall
Benishek	Diaz-Balart	Hanna
Berg	Dreier	Harper
Berkley	Duffy	Harris
Biggart	Duncan (SC)	Hartzler
Bilbray	Duncan (TN)	Hastings (WA)
Bilirakis	Ellmers	Hayworth
Bishop (UT)	Emerson	Heck
Black	Farenthold	Hensarling
Blackburn	Fincher	Herger
Bonner	Flake	Herrera Beutler
Boustany	Fleischmann	Huelskamp
Brady (TX)	Fleming	Huizenga (MI)
Brooks	Flores	Hultgren
Broun (GA)	Forbes	Hunter
Buchanan	Fortenberry	Hurt
Bucshon	Fox	Issa
Buerkle	Franks (AZ)	Jenkins
Calvert	Frelinghuysen	Johnson (IL)
Camp	Galleghy	Johnson (OH)
Campbell	Gardner	Johnson, Sam
Canseco	Garrett	Jones
Capito	Gibbs	Jordan
Carter	Gibson	Kelly
Cassidy	Gingrey (GA)	King (IA)
Chabot	Gohmert	King (NY)
Chaffetz	Goodlatte	Kingston
Coble	Gosar	Kline

Labrador	Nunnelee	Scott (SC)
Lamborn	Olson	Scott (VA)
Lance	Palazzo	Scott, Austin
Landry	Paulsen	Sensenbrenner
Lankford	Pearce	Shimkus
Latham	Pence	Shuler
LaTourette	Petri	Shuster
Latta	Pitts	Simpson
LoBiondo	Poe (TX)	Smith (NE)
Long	Pompeo	Smith (NJ)
Lucas	Posey	Smith (TX)
Luetkemeyer	Price (GA)	Southerland
Lummis	Quayle	Stearns
Lungren, Daniel	Reed	Stivers
E.	Rehberg	Stutzman
Mack	Reichert	Sullivan
Marchant	Renacci	Terry
McCarthy (CA)	Ribble	Thompson (PA)
McCaul	Rigell	Thornberry
McClintock	Rivera	Tiberi
McCotter	Roby	Tipton
McHenry	Roe (TN)	Turner (NY)
McKeon	Rogers (AL)	Turner (OH)
McKinley	Rogers (KY)	Upton
McMorris	Rogers (MI)	Walberg
Rodgers	Rohrabacher	Walden
Mica	Rokita	Webster
Michaud	Rooney	West
Miller (FL)	Ros-Lehtinen	Westmoreland
Miller (MI)	Roskam	Whitfield
Miller, Gary	Ross (FL)	Wilson (SC)
Mulvaney	Royce	Wittman
Murphy (PA)	Runyan	Wolf
Myrick	Ryan (WI)	Womack
Neugebauer	Scalise	Yoder
Noem	Schilling	Young (AK)
Nugent	Schmidt	Young (FL)
Nunes	Schweikert	Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—27

Akin	Gonzalez	Meehan
Bachus	Jackson (IL)	Paul
Bass (CA)	Kinziger (IL)	Platts
Bono Mack	Lee (CA)	Rangel
Burgess	Lewis (CA)	Rush
Cantor	Lipinski	Schock
Davis (IL)	Manzulio	Sessions
Doggett	Marino	Walsh (IL)
Dold	Markey	Yarmuth

□ 1649

Messrs. PRICE of Georgia, POSEY, COFFMAN of Colorado, BILIRAKIS, ROE of Tennessee, and Mrs. ROBY changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Messrs. AMASH and DAVID SCOTT of Georgia changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CHAFFETZ) having assumed the chair, Mr. LUCAS, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2087) to remove restrictions from a parcel of land situated in the Atlantic District, Accomack County, Virginia, and, pursuant to House Resolution 587, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

□ 1650

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. In its present form I am opposed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. Loretta Sanchez of California moves to recommit the bill H.R. 2087 to the Committee on Natural Resources with instructions to report the same to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. 2. PROHIBITION ON SALE OR USE OF LAND FOR ADULT ENTERTAINMENT OR BY FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS.

Any instrument executed pursuant to section 1(a) shall specify that the land described in section 1(c) shall not be sold, leased, or rented to—

(1) an owner or operator of an adult book, novelty, video, arcade, or live entertainment facility; or

(2) any foreign government that might pose a security threat to the NASA Wallops Flight Facility.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise today to offer a final amendment to H.R. 2087 that, if passed, would bring the bill promptly back for a vote on final passage. Mr. Speaker, this final amendment is noncontroversial, and it aims to do one simple thing—and that is to protect the land of taxpayers.

The bill, itself, goes against so many things that the majority has said that they would fight for in this Congress. This legislation would provide a local county in Virginia an \$800,000 windfall by allowing the county to violate a contractual agreement without any justification. That's the current bill. That's what the bill that you want to pass does. I'm against that. Here in this Congress we did away with earmarks. But when I look at this \$800,000 windfall that you are voting on, I say that's an earmark.

This is a very small step in the larger Republican plan to sell off our valuable Federal land, such as National Parks, forests, and public lands to developers. However, even if you're for giving away land the way that's done in this bill, my final amendment would give us the opportunity to ensure that this land would not be owned and used for adult entertainment facilities or sold to or used by a foreign government that could use this to steal our national security secrets.

So I ask my colleagues on the other side: Will you join us in protecting taxpayer-owned land?

The final amendment is very simple and would outlaw the sale or the use of the land for any ownership or operation of an adult book store, a novelty adult store, a video adult store, an arcade or live entertainment facility. I think we can all agree that we should not be giving away Federal property to facilitate adult live entertainment.

In fact, if you're not convinced of that, then let me tell you the second thing we don't want to happen close to that land, and that is that land adjoining this piece of property we're talking about today should not fall into the hands of those who would want to spy on our top secrets. As you probably know, I'm a senior member of both the House Armed Services Committee and the Homeland Security Committee, and every day, I deal with the issues of national security threats.

The issue is the proximity of the NASA Wallops spaceflight facility to the land in question, so my final amendment is aimed at protecting national security secrets from countries like China or Iran. What if a country like Iran or China would purchase that land and eavesdrop on our NASA spaceflight facility?

I am sure that my colleagues would agree that this land is worth protecting. In fact, to remind my colleagues on the other side, this is the final amendment to this bill. It's not going to kill the bill, and it won't take it back to committee. So, if adopted, the bill would be amended and it would go to final passage.

I ask my colleagues to do the right thing to protect our taxpayer-owned land. Regardless of how you feel about the bill, this amendment is one that I believe we should all be behind. I believe that we can all vote "yes" on this final amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, the author of this motion to recommit clearly did not hear the debate. This land is owned by Accomack County in Virginia. It is not a transfer. It's a deed restriction lift. That's all it is. The land is owned by a county in Virginia.

Mr. Speaker, when we had testimony on this bill in the committee, the government of Accomack County testified, obviously, in favor of it, and they said they wanted this for industrial use. Now, this is local control. Doesn't the other side even trust local control, for goodness sake, in testimony in front of a committee?

I have to say also that history tends to repeat itself. In this body, it tends to repeat itself, it seems like, on a weekly basis. Now, why do I say that? Because the two issues that are facing the American people are jobs and the price of energy. Yet here we have a bill in front of us that would certainly cre-

ate jobs. And what does the other side do? They want to put up more impediments to it.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the motion to recommit, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of passage.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 180, noes 226, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 116]

AYES—180

Ackerman	Fattah	Moran
Altmire	Filner	Murphy (CT)
Andrews	Frank (MA)	Nadler
Baca	Fudge	Napolitano
Baldwin	Garamendi	Neal
Barrow	Green, Al	Olver
Bass (CA)	Green, Gene	Owens
Becerra	Grijalva	Pallone
Berkley	Gutierrez	Pascrell
Berman	Hahn	Pastor (AZ)
Bishop (GA)	Hanabusa	Pelosi
Bishop (NY)	Hastings (FL)	Perlmutter
Blumenauer	Heinrich	Peters
Bonamici	Higgins	Peterson
Boren	Himes	Pingree (ME)
Boswell	Hinchey	Price (NC)
Brady (PA)	Hinojosa	Quigley
Braley (IA)	Hirono	Rahall
Brown (FL)	Hochul	Reyes
Butterfield	Holden	Richardson
Capps	Holt	Richmond
Capuano	Honda	Ross (AR)
Cardoza	Hoyer	Rothman (NJ)
Carnahan	Israel	Roybal-Allard
Carney	Jackson Lee	Ruppersberger
Carson (IN)	(TX)	Ryan (OH)
Castor (FL)	Johnson (GA)	Sánchez, Linda
Chandler	Johnson, E. B.	T.
Chu	Jones	Sanchez, Loretta
Cicilline	Kaptur	Sarbanes
Clarke (MI)	Keating	Schakowsky
Clarke (NY)	Kildee	Schiff
Clay	Kind	Schrader
Cleaver	Kissell	Schwartz
Clyburn	Kucinich	Scott, David
Cohen	Langevin	Serrano
Connolly (VA)	Larsen (WA)	Sewell
Conyers	Larson (CT)	Sherman
Cooper	Levin	Shuler
Costa	Lewis (GA)	Sires
Costello	Loebsock	Slaughter
Courtney	Loftgren, Zoe	Smith (WA)
Critz	Lowey	Speier
Crowley	Lujan	Stark
Cuellar	Lynch	Sutton
Cummings	Maloney	Thompson (CA)
Davis (CA)	Markey	Thompson (MS)
DeFazio	Matheson	Tierney
DeGette	Matsui	Tonko
DeLauro	McCarthy (NY)	Towns
Deutch	McCollum	Tsongas
Dicks	McDermott	Van Hollen
Dingell	McGovern	Velázquez
Donnelly (IN)	McIntyre	Visclosky
Doyle	McNerney	Walz (MN)
Edwards	Meeks	Wasserman
Ellison	Michaud	Schultz
Engel	Miller (NC)	
Eshoo	Miller, George	
Farr	Moore	

Waters Waxman Wilson (FL)
Watt Welch Woolsey

□ 1716

Mr. POLIS changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 240, noes 164, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 117]

AYES—240

NOES—226

Adams Olson
Aderholt Palazzo
Alexander Gosar
Amash Paulsen
Amodei Granger
Austria Graves (GA)
Bachmann Graves (MO)
Barletta Griffin (AR)
Bartlett Griffith (VA)
Barton (TX) Grimm
Bass (NH) Guinta
Benishkek Guthrie
Berg Hall
Biggert Harper
Bilbray Harris
Bilirakis Hartzler
Bishop (UT) Hastings (WA)
Black Hayworth
Blackburn Heck
Bonner Hensarling
Boustany Herger
Brady (TX) Herrera Beutler
Brooks Huelskamp
Broun (GA) Huizenga (MI)
Buchanan Hultgren
Bucshon Hunter
Buerkle Hurt
Burton (IN) Issa
Calvert Jenkins
Camp Johnson (IL)
Campbell Johnson (OH)
Canseco Johnson, Sam
Cantor Jordan
Capito Kelly
Carter King (IA)
Cassidy King (NY)
Chabot Kingston
Chaffetz Kline
Coble Labrador
Coffman (CO) Lamborn
Cole Lance
Conaway Landry
Cravaack Lankford
Crawford Latham
Crenshaw LaTourette
Culberson Latta
Davis (KY) LoBiondo
Denham Long
Dent Lucas
DesJarlais Luetkemeyer
Diaz-Balart Lummis
Dreier Lungren, Daniel
Duffy E.
Duncan (SC) Mack
Duncan (TN) Marchant
Ellmers McCarthy (CA)
Emerson McCaul
Farenthold McClintock
Fincher McCotter
Fitzpatrick McHenry
Flake McKeon
Fleischmann McKinley
Fleming McMorris
Flores Rodgers
Forbes Mica
Fortenberry Miller (FL)
Foss Miller (MI)
Franks (AZ) Miller, Gary
Frelinghuysen Mulvaney
Gallegly Murphy (PA)
Gardner Myrick
Garrett Neugebauer
Gerlach Noem
Gibbs Nugent
Gibson Nunes
Gingrey (GA) Nunnelee

NOT VOTING—25

Akin Jackson (IL)
Bachus Kinzinger (IL)
Bono Mack Lee (CA)
Burgess Lewis (CA)
Davis (IL) Lipinski
Doggett Manzullo
Dold Marino
Gohmert Meehan
Gonzalez Paul

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

Adams Lungren, Daniel
Aderholt E.
Alexander Mack
Amodei Marchant
Austria Frelinghuysen
Bachmann McCaul
Barletta McClintock
Barrow McCotter
Bartlett McHenry
Barton (TX) McIntyre
Benishkek McKeon
Berg Gohmert
Berkley Goodlatte
Biggert Gosar
Bilbray Gowdy
Bilirakis Granger
Bishop (UT) Graves (GA)
Black Graves (MO)
Blackburn Griffin (AR)
Bonner Griffith (VA)
Boren Mulvaney
Boswell Guinta
Boustany Guthrie
Brady (TX) Hall
Brooks Hanabusa
Broun (GA) Hanna
Buchanan Harper
Bucshon Harris
Buerkle Hartzler
Cantor Hastings (WA)
Capito Hayworth
Carter Heck
Cassidy Heinrich
Chabot Hensarling
Chaffetz Herger
Chandler Hultgren
Coble Issa
Coffman (CO) Jenkins
Cole Johnson (IL)
Conaway Johnson (OH)
Cravaack Johnson, Sam
Crawford Jones
Crenshaw Jordan
Culberson Kelly
Davis (KY) King (IA)
DeFazio King (NY)
Denham Kingston
Dent Kissell
DesJarlais Kline
Diaz-Balart Labrador
Dreier Lamborn
Duffy Lance
Duncan (SC) Landry
Duncan (TN) Lankford
Ellmers Larsen (WA)
Emerson Latham
Farenthold LaTourette
Fincher Latta
Flake LoBiondo
Fleischmann Long
Fleming Lucas
Flores Luetkemeyer
Lummis Schweikert

Scott (SC)
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns

Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Webster

NOES—164

Ackerman
Altmire
Amash
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner

NOT VOTING—27

Akin Kinzinger (IL)
Bachus Lee (CA)
Bass (NH) Lewis (CA)
Bono Mack Lipinski
Cleaver Manzullo
Davis (IL) Marino
Doggett Meehan
Dold Paul
Gonzalez Perlmutter
Jackson (IL) Rangel

□ 1725

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. AKIN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall Nos. 115, 116 and 117, I was delayed and unable to vote. Had I been present I would have voted “no” on No. 115, “no” on No. 116, and “aye” on No. 117.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, due to district business, I was unavoidably back in my Congressional District on March 20, 2012. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on H.R. 665, the Excess Federal Building and Property Disposal Act of 2011, and "yea" on H.R. 2087, "To remove restrictions from a parcel of land situated in the Atlantic District, Accomack County, Virginia."

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO THE JOINT CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE ON INAUGURAL CEREMONIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to Senate Concurrent Resolution 35, 112th Congress and the order of the House of January 5, 2011, of the following Members of the House to the Joint Congressional Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies:

Mr. BOEHNER, Ohio
Mr. CANTOR, Virginia
Ms. PELOSI, California

REPEAL THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, just last week the non-partisan Congressional Budget Office served a devastating blow to President Obama's most frequently uttered promise during debate over the Affordable Care Act: "If you like your present coverage, you can keep it."

The CBO predicted the law would lead to a net loss of employer-based insurance coverage for between three and five million people each year between the years of 2019 and 2022, with as many as 20 million Americans losing their current insurance plans.

Now, as we approach the second anniversary of the Affordable Care Act, the full impact of this law remains unknown. However, a few things are quite clear. Supporters said it would lower costs. It hasn't. They said it would improve quality. It hasn't. The President said you can keep your current plan if you like it. This clearly is not the case.

By the administration's own estimates, the new health care regulations will force most firms, and up to 80 percent of small businesses, to give up their current plans by 2013.

Mr. Speaker, the American people can't afford another year of the so-called Affordable Care Act.

RECOGNIZING THE BETH DAVID CONGREGATION'S 100TH ANNIVERSARY

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize the 100th anni-

versary of the Beth David Congregation in my congressional district. This Saturday, March 24, Beth David will hold its centennial celebration to honor its congregation and its founding members.

For the last century, Beth David has been the cornerstone of the south Florida Jewish community. What started out as a congregation of just a handful of dedicated Jewish families has become a dynamic, thriving institution that is the cultural and educational epicenter for Judaism in south Florida.

But Beth David does not just have an incredibly rich history of outstanding service to the Jewish community. No, the congregation has been at the forefront and actively engaging our entire community, tirelessly working to repair the community one mitzvah at a time. And for that I congratulate Beth David, and I thank all of the congregation for everything they have done and everything they have meant to our south Florida community.

I wish them continued success and 100 more years.

REPEAL IPAB

(Mr. FLEMING asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Speaker, we now have reached a landmark, 2 years since the passage of ObamaCare. More and more, the American people have been hearing about something called IPAB, the Independent Payment Advisory Board—the centerpiece to ObamaCare and its inevitable rationing of health care.

This is a board of 15 unelected, unaccountable and not necessarily health care-experienced individuals who will have more power than even Congress, itself, when it comes to deciding what care every American will receive. The board members will not be under congressional oversight and will not answer the phone when you call to complain. Americans agree by 57 percent to 38 percent margins ObamaCare and IPAB should be fully repealed.

So far, Democrats have been unwilling to listen to the outcry from the American people. They will have yet another chance to respond to "we the people's" unhappiness with ObamaCare by voting with Republicans this week to repeal IPAB. And, hopefully, they will be willing to vote to repeal ObamaCare, itself, in its entirety when it is brought up for a vote sometime in the future.

□ 1730

IPAB

(Mr. ROE of Tennessee asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we begin debate on a bill that would eliminate the Independent Payment Advisory Board, one of the

most toxic components of President Obama's Affordable Care Act. This denial-of-care board is comprised of 15 unelected, unaccountable bureaucrats that will be empowered to cut Medicare in order to meet arbitrary spending targets.

Not only will this result in seniors being denied access to medical care they need, it will also put the government in the middle of the patient-doctor relationship.

Spending cuts proposed by the IPAB will automatically go into effect unless Congress finds alternative cuts of the same amount. And because implementation of the board's recommendations is exempted from judicial review, citizens can't even turn to the courts for help.

As a physician with over 30 years in practice, I can tell you that the President's proposal, which he has repeatedly defended, is wrongheaded and dangerous.

We must act to save Medicare from bankruptcy, which will come as soon as 2016, but IPAB is not and must not be the answer.

ONGOING HEALTH CARE DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GOWDY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. WOODALL. I appreciate the majority leader giving me the time to come down here today, because I've got IPAB on my mind, Mr. Speaker. I say that like everybody knows what that is because we talk about it here in this Chamber all day long. IPAB, a word that was not even in the lexicon of America until the President passed his health care bill.

What is IPAB? I happened to bring down with me today, Mr. Speaker, the front page of the President's health care bill, the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act as he describes it. This was the 900-page law that was passed that completely restructured a sixth of the American economy.

The question then is, when we're talking about the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and we're talking about how we change the individual health care decisions that every American gets to make, what do we get for it? What's the value added there? Because I think, Mr. Speaker, at the end of the day, when folks are talking about what motivates them, it really is affordable care. That's why we named the bill this way, the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act. We want patients to be protected, to be able to make their own health care choices. We want care to be made available to folks at prices that American families can afford. There are 900 pages in that health care bill, Mr. Speaker.

Now, IPAB, how would we describe it? We would call IPAB the hammer in the health care bill, because there are

lots of ways to save money, Mr. Speaker. You can save money by introducing competition into a system.

I'm from Atlanta, Mr. Speaker. I've got a soft spot in my heart for the Coca-Cola Company. But how many Coca-Cola machines do you pass on the street where the Coke is selling for \$3 a can while the Pepsi right beside it is selling for \$1.50? How many? Have you ever seen that happen? The answer is "no" because competition completely moves those machines out of the marketplace. If the Pepsi is a dollar, the Coke's going to be a dollar, too. If the Pepsi is \$2, the Coke is going to be \$2. Competition controls those prices.

What controls prices in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act? Because we've heard time and time again, Mr. Speaker, on the floor of this House that the Patient Protection Act restricts my choices as a consumer. We've heard time and time again on the floor of this House, Mr. Speaker, that the Patient Protection Act restricts doctors and the services that they provide. We've heard time and time again, Mr. Speaker, that the Patient Protection Act restricts the choices that insurance companies can provide. So, if it's all of these restrictions on competition, how in the world does the Patient Protection Act save the money that needs to be saved to make health care affordable?

The answer is this: It's in section 3403. Again, I don't encourage folks at home to read this bill, Mr. Speaker, unless they've got time on their hands. There's lots of good summaries out there. It's over 900 pages long, and it's signed into law. I don't think folks are going to be able to read this back in their offices, Mr. Speaker.

This is about 46 pages that I've put up here just on one in case we needed to reference it, but 46 pages of law defining this brand-new thing that we've never had before in America, the Independent Payment Advisory Board.

If you read these 40 pages, Mr. Speaker, what you're going to find is that the Congress that passed the President's health care bill—and it was not this Congress, Mr. Speaker. You were not here in that Congress. I was not here in that Congress. It did not pass the Congress under normal rules and procedures. It passed in a manipulated reconciliation process designed intentionally to thwart the will of the House and of the Senate. But in that bill, they said Congress can't control these costs; and, candidly, I'm glad. I don't want Congress controlling my health care costs.

So what did they do? They went to an independent commission. The President is going to appoint this commission, Mr. Speaker. The President will appoint members to sit on this independent Medicare advisory board, and what they will do is decide where Medicare should save money.

Now, my mom and dad just went on Medicare, Mr. Speaker. I sit down with them. I look at their statement of

charges that they get back when they go to the doctor's office. It's not always easy to understand, but we go through it together. It occurs to me that if Medicare is going to save money, there is only one way Medicare can do that. If we don't allow competition in the system, if we don't allow patient choice in the system, if we don't allow provider choice in the system, there is only one way that Medicare can save a dime; that is by restricting services. Now, that comes in lots of different ways, and I want to make sure I'm absolutely candid, Mr. Speaker, and accurate, because this is the panel.

Do you remember the death panel discussions? Do you remember that becoming a part of the lexicon in America, the death panels that Congress was going to create? This is that. I mean, this is where that idea came from, because what we have here is a board that makes decisions, recommendations about how to change Medicare spending.

Well, if we're not going to provide competition, if we're not going to allow doctors more decisions, if we're not going to allow other providers more decisions, then the only way to change the financing structure of Medicare is to restrict either the services that Medicare provides or the amount of money that is being paid to providers.

Now, I want to give my friends who passed this bill the benefit of the doubt, Mr. Speaker. I don't believe there is a single Member of this body who would stand here in the well and say that their decision about how to save the Medicare program is to restrict the services that Medicare beneficiaries can access, not one. I don't think one Member, Republican or Democrat, will come to the well of this House and say that their proposal for saving Medicare is to find seniors in need of health care and tell them "no." Not one. But, Mr. Speaker, what's the effect, then, of the Independent Payment Advisory Board?

Let's look at what folks have said.

This is GEORGE MILLER, one of my colleagues here on the floor of the House, a Democrat from California. We're taking up, tomorrow, a bill that will repeal this Independent Payment Advisory Board, this Medicare board. We're going to repeal it tomorrow, I believe, here on the floor of the House. When talking about that, my colleague from California said this:

IPAB is a critical measure for lowering health care costs.

He's absolutely right. I'm not picking on him at all. I'm endorsing what he has to say. That's what these 40 pages of law, Mr. Speaker, do. They are all designed to cut costs. But we've talked about it. If we're not going to introduce competition, if we're not going to introduce choices, if we're not going to introduce options, how are we going to cut costs? We all agree, Republicans and Democrats alike, that the IPAB board is a critical measure for lowering health care costs.

Peter Orszag, the OMB Director, the first one that President Obama used, said this about health care costs in Medicare:

The core problem is that health care costs are concentrated among expensive treatments for chronic diseases and for end-of-life care.

□ 1740

Mr. Speaker, let me reflect on that a minute. I've just shown you the 40 pages of law in the President's health care bill that are the cost-saving mechanism that the President has proposed and that has been passed into law. The OMB Director, the Office of Management and Budget Director, for the Obama administration said this:

The core problem is that health care costs are concentrated among expensive treatments for chronic diseases and for end-of-life care.

Mr. Speaker, what choices, then, does that give us? If we agree that IPAB is a critical measure for lowering health care costs and if we agree that health care costs are primarily concentrated with expensive treatments for chronic diseases and end-of-life care, how exactly is this unelected board going to lower those costs?

It's an honest question. If that's what has to happen for Medicare to be saved, exactly how is this board going to do that? Every American on Medicare and every American approaching Medicare needs to have that on their mind. What is it that IPAB, this unelected board, is going to do to save costs? We all—Republicans and Democrats alike—agree that the only purpose of IPAB is to control costs. We agree—Republicans and Democrats alike—that the money in Medicare is concentrated among expensive treatments for chronic diseases and end-of-life care. So if IPAB is going to control costs and the costs are here, what choice do we have but to deny individuals expensive treatments for chronic diseases and end-of-life care? What else is there?

To me, that's common sense, that this is where the President's proposal is going. I do not endorse this proposal. I was not here in this Congress, Mr. Speaker, when this proposal passed. Had I been here, I would have voted an enthusiastic "no."

Nevertheless, it is the law of the land as we sit here today, and our seniors are at risk. How many times have we heard supporters of the President's health care bill say, No, IPAB is not a Medicare rationing board. In fact, if you want to dig deep into these 40 pages, you'll find that said over and over again. Folks continually say, this is not a Medicare rationing board. But we know where the costs are, and the question is how do we control them.

What my friends who support the President's health care bill say is, no, we're not going to deny care to Medicare beneficiaries; we're just going to clamp down on payments to doctors. That's what they say: We're just going to change the payment schedules for doctors.

I've got news for you, Mr. Speaker. That's been the Medicare plan for decade, upon decade, upon decade, upon decade; and this is what you get. This is from a CNNMoney article from January 6 of this year titled "Doctors Going Broke." It recounts the many changes that have happened in the Medicare system as we continue to do nothing about choices, nothing about options, nothing about getting the consumer involved in health care decisions, but continuing to use the same old broken tools to solve the Medicare issue. It says this:

In 2005, Medicare revised the reimbursement guidelines for cancer drugs, which effectively made reimbursements for many expensive cancer drugs fall to less than the actual cost of the drugs.

You can tell me you don't want a Medicare rationing board, Mr. Speaker. I don't want a Medicare rationing board either. But if what we're going to have is a board that is going to cut the costs of Medicare and they're going to do that by cutting reimbursements to providers and what we already see is that we're cutting reimbursements to providers to the point that those reimbursements fall below the cost of the service, what do you think is going to happen to Medicare beneficiaries when they go to seek services? I'll tell you.

The President's health care bill, Mr. Speaker, primarily solved the challenge of the uninsured by dumping them onto State Medicaid policies. I don't think that is a particularly creative solution, but it is certainly an option.

My uncle is a primary care doc down in central Georgia. There used to be a bunch of docs who would see Medicare patients in that part of the world. Today he's the only one who will see Medicaid. He is the only one. In five counties, Mr. Speaker, he is the only doc that will see Medicaid patients. Don't tell me that our goal here in Congress is to help patients find care if we're going to lower reimbursement rates to a place where no doctor will accept them. I don't care that you have an insurance policy if you can't find a doctor who will take it. It does not matter that the government says you're guaranteed health care if you can't find a doctor who will provide it.

Mr. Speaker, that's not news to anyone who has had a job in the private sector; that's not news to anyone who has had to write paychecks from their business; and it's not news to anyone who has been a consumer.

I'm a coupon clipper, Mr. Speaker. I cut them out of the Sunday paper. I go into the store, I've got a big old coupon, I think I'm going to get a good deal, and the store doesn't carry the product. What is that coupon worth to me if I can't find the product, Mr. Speaker? Not a thing. That's what we're doing when we clamp down on costs. Don't you dare believe that we can continue to cut docs year after year after year after year and that your family and my family, who are on

Medicare, are going to be able to find care. They cannot.

From that same article, Mr. Speaker, "Doctors Going Broke." Again, January 6, 2012, from CNN Money Magazine. Dr. William Pentz said:

Recent steep 35 percent to 40 percent cuts in Medicare reimbursements for key cardiovascular services, such as stress tests and echocardiograms, have taken a substantial toll on revenue.

He also says:

These cuts have destabilized private cardiology practices. A third of our patients are on Medicare.

So these Medicare cuts are by far the biggest factor. Then, Mr. Speaker, he says private insurers follow Medicare rates. Those reimbursements are going down as well. You know, he is right about that. When the Federal Government pays two-thirds of all the health care costs in this country, Mr. Speaker, and the Federal Government decides it can get away with paying less, guess what? Everybody else wants to get away with paying less too. That is a good capitalist system. I don't fault folks for that. What I fault folks for is standing on the floor of this House and promising the American people a program that they pay into all of their life so it will be available for them in their time of need and then cutting rates to a place where you cannot find a doctor who will serve you. Mr. Speaker, the hypocrisy of saying that we're going to care about people in their time of need and putting the people out of business who provide for them in that time of need is deafening.

I go again to that same article of January 6, 2012, "Doctors Going Broke." The same doctor, William Pentz, a cardiologist there in Philadelphia:

If this continues, I might seriously consider leaving medicine. I can't keep working this way.

He goes on to talk about how the law of the land is going to provide even further cuts. He said:

If that continues, it will put us under.

My dad is going in for heart surgery in about 30 days, Mr. Speaker. We shopped long and hard to find a doctor that we would trust to do that surgery, just as every American family does.

Who are folks going to trust, Mr. Speaker? Who are folks going to find if we put the people who provide the care out of business?

IPAB, Mr. Speaker, these 40 pages from the President's health care bill, the only 40 pages that are designed to reduce costs, do not reduce costs through competition, do not reduce costs by providing consumer choices, do not reduce costs by getting consumers involved in their own health care. They reduce costs by either rationing services or by cutting reimbursements to a place where the marketplace rations those services on its own.

Don't believe for a moment, Mr. Speaker, that cutting reimbursements to doctors doesn't equal cutting serv-

ices. That's really the hypocrisy, Mr. Speaker, for lack of a better word, that I hear on the floor of this House:

Oh, we're going to go out there and we're going to save all this money. How are you going to do it?

We're going to go out there and cut those reimbursements to docs.

All right. It sounds like you're liable to end up rationing services.

Oh, no. IPAB, that's not going to ration any services. No, no, no. They don't have the authority to cut out services. That's not what they do.

Well, what are they going to do?

Well, they're going to cut the reimbursement rates.

Well, what's going to happen?

Well, docs will just keep providing those services.

□ 1750

We saw it here.

Money magazine tells you, when you are only reimbursing folks at the cost of the service or less, they're going to quit providing. According to factcheck.org—those folks who go around and look at all the claims politicians make and try to figure out which ones are real and which ones are full of hot air—this is what they said: "31 percent of primary physicians restricted Medicare patients in their practices." You know what that means. That means that 31 percent of all the doctors in the land who provide primary care services, those most-needed services, said they do not take every Medicare patient that comes knocking on their door. They can't. They restrict how many Medicare patients they'll take into their practice.

We've already seen that we're putting docs out of business. We're forcing docs into retirement. Who is going to provide the care, Mr. Speaker? Who is going to provide the care if we force the people who do it today out of business tomorrow?

Back to factcheck.org: "62 percent of family practitioners would stop accepting Medicare patients if reimbursement rate cuts follow current law." Hear that, Mr. Speaker. Hear that. Let me say it again: If reimbursement rates follow the current law, I'm not talking about if some new draconian procedure gets put in place. I'm not talking about if some crazy future Congress comes in here and tries to further socialize health care. No, no. If the current law of the land, as passed before you and I came to Congress, Mr. Speaker, if the current law of the land continues, 62 percent of family practitioners would stop accepting Medicare patients.

What is IPAB going to do? It's going to control costs. How's it going to do it? It's going to do it by cutting reimbursements to providers. What happens when you cut reimbursements to providers? Sixty-two percent of all of America's family practitioners will stop accepting Medicare patients.

Mr. Speaker, what we do here has consequences. This isn't some think

tank downtown that has the freedom to just pontificate, to make recommendations, to wonder how things could have been. This is a body where every single thing that we do has the potential to affect—positively or negatively—the lives of every single citizen of the land.

There are no free lunches in America, Mr. Speaker. There is no something for nothing. You can control costs through competition. You can control costs through getting consumers involved in their own health care. You can control costs by providing folks with more choices. You cannot control costs responsibly by putting providers out of business and rationing care through the long lines that are then going to result.

We are going to deal with this bill tomorrow, in fact, and I would be happy to yield to my friend from the Rules Committee to help make that happen.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5, PROTECTING ACCESS TO HEALTHCARE ACT

Mr. NUGENT, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 112-416) on the resolution (H. Res. 591) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5) to improve patient access to health care services and provide improved medical care by reducing the excessive burden the liability system places on the health care delivery system, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

ONGOING HEALTH CARE DEBATE—Continued

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia may proceed.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that.

I was very lucky when my friend from Florida came to file that rule because that's another example that what we're doing down here isn't just howling at the Moon. It isn't just blowing hot air.

What I'm talking about here on the floor right now is repealing this Independent Payment Advisory Board to stop this cycle of destruction that has already been put into place. And no sooner do we come down here to do it than my colleague from the Rules Committee comes down to file this rule, Mr. Speaker, so that we can do this bill not 2 years from today, not after the next election, not 6 months from now, kicking the can down the road, but so that we can bring this bill to the floor tomorrow to address the concerns that we're talking about today. That's why you and I came to Congress, Mr. Speaker. That's why this whole freshman class came to Congress.

You know, I've only been here now about, what, 14, 15 months, Mr. Speaker. And what I have found is that each and every day, my colleagues in this freshman class do not evaluate their

success by how many favorable newspaper articles are written about them. They don't evaluate their success by how many times they've seen their face on TV. And they certainly don't evaluate their success based on what the mass media writes about them in this town. They evaluate their success based on whether or not the promises they made to folks before they got elected are the priorities that they've set for themselves now that they have been elected. And each and every day, I see people making that a reality. Republicans and Democrats alike, Mr. Speaker, in this freshman class came to this Congress for a different purpose, with a different mission, with a different vision. And I see them implementing it every day. It makes me proud.

Speaking of being proud, Mr. Speaker, you know, folks back home say, ROB, how come we don't see you on FOX News preaching the good conservative news? I tell them, Mr. Speaker, that anybody who is watching FOX News already knows the good conservative news. They don't need to hear it from me. The folks who need to hear from me are the folks who are watching MSNBC. That is who needs to hear my message. And I happened to bring some MSNBC knowledge down here with me today.

This is a headline recently from the Web page, Mr. Speaker. This is what it said: "In risky election year move, Republicans offer Medicare alternatives." Ooh. It kind of sounds ominous, doesn't it, Mr. Speaker? Ominous. "In risky election year move, Republicans offer Medicare alternatives." Why? Why? For the reason I just talked about, Mr. Speaker, where we have this freshman class, where we have these senior Members of Congress who didn't come here to pontificate, who didn't come here to grandstand, who came here to make a difference.

I don't care that it's an election year. In fact, if anything, Mr. Speaker, in an election year, we ought to do more of the right things. We ought to spend even more time each and every day getting it right. "Risky election year move" is what folks say. I tell you, Mr. Speaker, I would be disappointed if we did anything else. Medicare is in crisis. This IPAB board is further destabilizing the Medicare program. You are doggone right it may be a risky move, but we did it anyway because it's the right thing to do.

I sit on the Budget Committee. That is actually what they are talking about. This is a March 15 article. And they're talking about the plan that we in the Budget Committee are going to hold a markup on tomorrow, which does what? All of these things I've been talking about, Mr. Speaker: bringing choices to consumers, bringing competition to the Medicare system, investing consumers in Medicare outcomes. It does all of those things, Mr. Speaker, that we believe can control costs using the power of the market-

place, using the power of the American people, using the power of the American family, and not just by rationing care, as this IPAB board does.

This is the headline. I'm going to read it again, Mr. Speaker, just because I like it so much: "In risky election year move, Republicans offer Medicare alternatives." They go on to say this: "Running a political risk during an election year, Republicans continue to offer proposals to cut future Medicare outlays." Medicare outlays, that's this dramatic rise we see in Medicare spending, Mr. Speaker. It's not a rise associated with quality of care. It's not a rise that's associated with whether or not people get the services they need. It's a rise that's associated with an out-of-control Federal health care program that has absolutely no consumer involvement at all, absolutely no competition at all, absolutely no free market involvement at all. And it's going broke.

We have a proposal to fix it. What is our proposal? Well, I didn't just bring our proposal, Mr. Speaker. But I brought our proposal, and I want to compare it to the President's approach. There are two things we need to talk about when we talk about changes to Medicare, Mr. Speaker, and you know this better than most. There are changes to the Medicare program that save it for future generations, and then there are changes to the Medicare program that destabilize today's seniors. A big difference in those two things.

□ 1800

I'm in my forties, Mr. Speaker. My Uncle Sam has to come to me today and say, ROB, I know you've been paying your Medicare taxes in every single paycheck since you were 16 and I know we promised you that Medicare was going to be there for you like it was there for your grandparents and your parents; but ROB, we've got bad news. It turns out we overpromised and we're underdelivering and we've got to renegotiate our Medicare contract with you.

We do.

That is the bad, bad news for your generation, Mr. Speaker, for my generation, and for everybody younger. The government—surprise, surprise—has overpromised and underdelivered. And the time to tell me that is now, not when I'm 65 and I can't make any more choices about my life, but today while I can still make accommodations.

So I've divided this chart, Mr. Speaker, up into two categories—what are our proposals for current seniors and what are our proposals for future seniors—and I've done the same thing for the President's plan, because it is important that we do keep our promises here. It's no senior's fault in this country that they're dependent on Medicare. They paid into it their entire life for the part A through the Medicare taxes. They were promised it would be there for them in their time of need.

They didn't ask for it. They didn't solicit it. The money was taken from them and now they deserve those benefits.

So here's what we do. The program that's coming out of the House Budget Committee, the program similar to what was passed on the floor of the House last year and it's coming before the House next week, Mr. Speaker, has absolutely no changes—no changes, Mr. Speaker—for today's seniors. If you're on Medicare today, no changes, no disruptions in our plan, Mr. Speaker. That service, it's already begun for you and it is going to continue uninterrupted for as long as you need to utilize the program. But the program is going bankrupt, Mr. Speaker, and so we're making some changes that will preserve and protect it for this current generation of seniors. If we do nothing, bankruptcy looms on the horizon. And if current seniors want it, we'll allow them to get what I'll call personalized Medicare like what Members of Congress have.

Mr. Speaker, folks often think—in fact, my mom sends me that email about once a week that says, ROB, I can't believe you're getting all that free health care in Congress. You know that's nonsense, Mr. Speaker. We have exactly the same health care plan in Congress that every Federal employee across the country has. And that plan is this: You open up a book that has about 30 plans to choose from and you choose the one that works best for you. Imagine that.

Imagine that our seniors today have had a lifetime of health care choices, and the day they turn 65, Mr. Speaker, they surrender their freedom as an American and they are forced into a health care system that they cannot opt out of—cannot opt out of. Oh, you're in it. You can opt out of Medicare part D, you can opt out of Medicare part B, but you cannot opt out of Medicare part A. You are in it.

And if you want a doctor that won't take you—he'll take other Medicare patients but he won't take you—the Federal law of the land prohibits you, Mr. Speaker, from paying cash out of your pocket to see your doctor. That's the law of the land where? Russia? China? It's the law of the land in America.

You turn 65, you enter the Big Government health care program, suddenly your freedoms begin to be eroded. We say no. We say let's make Medicare have the choices that we as Members of Congress have, and let's make those available to current seniors.

So to recap, Mr. Speaker, no changes or disruptions in our plan. We preserve and protect the program for current seniors for the 30-year life of the program and we personalize Medicare to make it more like what we have in Congress so that we can give those folks choices.

What does the President do for current seniors? He empowers 15 unelected bureaucrats to cut Medicare in ways

that will most certainly deny seniors care. Do I need to go back to the 40 pages, Mr. Speaker, of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, section 3403, the advisory board, IPAB? This is what it does. It's the 15 unelected bureaucrats that have the power to cut Medicare in ways that, as we have discussed, will most certainly deny care.

If your plan is to cut reimbursements to doctors, fair enough. I think it's shortsighted; I think it's destructive. But if that is your plan, embrace that plan, I say to folks who support the President's health care bill. Embrace it and defend it. But be honest with the American people who most certainly know that if you cut those reimbursement rates to a level that doctors cannot see patients, they will not see patients.

And here's one that doesn't get talked about much, Mr. Speaker. The President's plan raids the Medicare program and removes \$682 billion. This is a program that's already going bankrupt. This is a program that already needs substantial reform to protect it and preserve it for another generation.

The President's health care bill, which isn't something that might happen, it's something that's already the law of the land, takes \$682 billion that was intended for Medicare beneficiaries and cuts it out—"saves it" is the term of art they use around here, Mr. Speaker, as you well know—cuts it and saves it. What do they save it for? So they can bring it over here and spend it on the President's new health care plan for the rest of America; the nonseniors.

The program is already in trouble. Current law under the President's health care plan removes \$682 billion designated for Medicare beneficiaries, takes it out, moves it to the rest of the population, again, exacerbating the challenge.

Future seniors, what are we going to do? Well, our plan, Mr. Speaker, coming out of the Budget Committee, coming here to the floor as passed by the House last year, is personalized Medicare not just for current seniors but for future seniors, Mr. Speaker. For folks like you and me and our generation, when we get to Medicare age, we would have choices. All Americans would have choices to choose the plan that works best for them.

Do you need a plan that covers prescription drugs? Choose that. Do you need a plan that is flexible so you can summer in Florida and winter in New Jersey? Though I suspect, Mr. Speaker, they'd probably be summering in New Jersey and wintering in Florida; but if they travel like that, maybe they need that plan. Maybe they still have young kids in the house and so need a plan that speaks to youngsters as well.

Folks could choose the plan, Mr. Speaker. Personalized health care, just like what we have here in Congress. Our plan, Mr. Speaker, means that wealthy families will get less and sick and low-income families will get more.

Mr. Speaker, we talk about shared sacrifice around here all the time, and I am not in favor of raising taxes on the American people. The American people can't afford it. The economy can't survive it. But what we can do is start giving away less from Washington, D.C.

And so what we say for future seniors—folks in my generation, your generation, Mr. Speaker—is that your support from the Medicare program is going to be less than low-income families. If you've done well in your life and you can afford to help with the cost of your Medicare, we're going to ask you to do that. We're going to means-test these things.

We're still going to be there for you; the Medicare program is still going to be there for you. The promises we made to you are still going to be kept. But in the renegotiation, we're going to confess what America already knows, which is that this program is going bankrupt and cannot be sustained, and that in order to sustain it, we're going to ask folks who can't afford it to pay more and recognize that folks who can't afford it will pay less. That's our program for the future to save and strengthen Medicare.

What does the President propose? And this is so important, Mr. Speaker. Can I go back to what my good friends at MSNBC said? This is how they described this plan that I'm just describing to you: In a risky election year move, Republicans offer Medicare alternatives.

The President, for future seniors, offers no serious plan to save Medicare. If I had the President's budget down here with me, Mr. Speaker, it would be about 12 inches tall. And it's a serious budget. I don't fault him for submitting the budget. I'm glad he did. It lays out his priorities and his strategy for saving America. But there's not one Medicare reform proposal in those 12 inches of budget. Not one. Not one.

Why?

Because traditional politicians, Mr. Speaker, think it's risky in an election year to propose things that shake up the status quo. Mr. Speaker, it ought to be risky in an election year to maintain the status quo when you know a program depended on by millions upon millions upon millions of seniors is going bankrupt today.

□ 1810

Not tomorrow, not 10 years from now. It's happening today. It's under way today. The time to stop it and save it is today. And I don't care if folks think it's scary to propose it; that's what we came here to do.

What happened, Mr. Speaker? What happened to folks that caused them to believe the reason they came to Congress is to get reelected? What happened? You didn't come here to get reelected. I didn't come here to get reelected. We came here to make a difference for families back home, we came here to draw a line in the sand

for saving America, and we came here to get the American Dream of a successful economy and freedom back on track. It ought to be risky to sit here and do nothing, Mr. Speaker. That ought to be the risky thing.

What has happened to this country that the risky thing for those who call themselves public servants is to do something instead of nothing? Because that's what the President proposes in his 10-year budget plan: nothing, nothing that does one thing, that takes one baby step forward toward saving Medicare. In the Budget Committee, we are proposing serious alternatives. Are they going to be frightening to folks in my generation? I don't think so, Mr. Speaker. You and I have a long time until retirement. Despite all our gray hair, we've got a couple of decades left before we get there; and we've got time to prepare, and we will, and America will. But it is our responsibility to offer those alternatives. The President offers nothing, and Medicare goes bankrupt.

This chart says it all, Mr. Speaker. There is a path to prosperity for America that we are proposing here in this House, and there is the President's approach, and they could not be more different.

Our approach tells the American people the truth. There are a lot of political pundits out there that believe telling people the truth is a risky thing to do in an election year. Mr. Speaker, I tell you it's our solemn obligation. I tell you the oath we took requires us to tell folks the truth. I tell you the responsibility that our voters back home have entrusted us with requires us to be bold.

And if the consequence for trying to save the Medicare program—not just for this generation of seniors, but for a generation to come—if the consequence of that is that I frighten voters back home and I get defeated, so be it. So be it. No one sent us here to get reelected year after year. They sent us here to do the work that they asked us to do. They sent us here to follow through on the promises that we made during the last campaign. They sent us here to offer serious solutions to what we all know, Democrats and Republicans alike, are serious problems threatening the future of our Republic. And none is more serious when it comes to a social safety net here in this country than the giant fiscal crisis looming in Medicare.

I'll leave you with this, Mr. Speaker. We have the law of the land that's already on the books. It's in the President's Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, that bill that raids Medicare in order to fund his other social priorities, that bill that hastens the demise of Medicare rather than preventing it. And in that they find 15 unelected bureaucrats that they say will not ration services; they'll just cut reimbursements for docs. And we have testimony after testimony after testimony after testimony that says, go

ahead, if you think you need to cut docs, cut docs; but just know those docs will not be there for you when you need them to be because they can't—because they can't.

Do you really believe it, Mr. Speaker? Does anybody in America really believe it? Find your primary care doctor that lives down the street from you. You know him or her. They're in your Sunday school class and they coach your kids' soccer team. You know who they are. Do you really believe that they're the ones that are driving the Medicare program into bankruptcy? Do you really believe it? Or does the Washington establishment just use our docs, the healers in our community, those folks who are there for us when we need them the most? Does the Washington establishment just use those folks as the scapegoats for what is a much more serious, much more systemic underlying problem with the way that we finance federally funded health care systems in this country?

Competition has served this country well, Mr. Speaker. Individual responsibility has served this country well. Entrepreneurship and innovation have served this country well. And we have a choice now to embrace those functions that are so indicative of who we are as Americans and where we've come from, and use those tools to set Medicare on a new and sustainable course; or we can go back to business as usual, more pages of Federal regulation, more blaming other people for the problems we've created, more unelected boards of bureaucrats who make health care decisions for us instead of letting us make those decisions within our family.

The choice for me is clear. Mr. Speaker, you know these aren't things that we're just down here to talk about. You know these aren't just ideas that are being brainstormed. We have a real opportunity to make this change not 2 years from now, not after the next election, not 6 months from now, but tomorrow. Tomorrow we'll bring a rule to the floor of this House to allow for a consideration of a measure that will repeal IPAB once and for all. IPAB, this word that was not in our lexicon 2 years ago but now threatens to control the health care decisions of every senior in America.

With a successful vote tomorrow, Mr. Speaker, we can make that a thing of the past.

And with that, I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BACHUS (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of minor throat surgery.

Mr. MARINO (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today and the balance of the week on account of illness.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 16 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 21, 2012, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

5313. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of General Peter W. Chiarelli, United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

5314. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Edgar E. Stanton III, United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

5315. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary of Defense, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Jeffery A. Remington, United States Air Force, and his advancement on the retired list to the grade of lieutenant general; to the Committee on Armed Services.

5316. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Flood Elevation Determinations [Docket ID: FEMA-2011-0002] received February 12, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

5317. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Flood Elevation Determinations [Docket ID: FEMA-2011-0002] received February 12, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

5318. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility [Docket ID: FEMA-2012-0003] [Internal Agency Docket No.: FEMA-B-8217] received February 12, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

5319. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Flood Elevation Determinations [Docket ID: FEMA-2011-0002] received February 12, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

5320. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Office of Electricity Diversity and Energy Reliability, Department of Energy, transmitting a report entitled "2010 Smart Grid System Report"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5321. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting Annual Report to Congress on FDA Foreign Offices Provisions of the FDA Food Safety and Modernization Act, pursuant to Public Law 111-353, section 201(b); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5322. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Department's final rule — Implementation of the Commercial Advertisement Loudness Mitigation (CALM) Act [MB Docket No.: 11-93] received March 1,

2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5323. A letter from the Deputy General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Interpretation of Protection System Reliability Standard [Docket No.: RM10-5-000; Order No. 758] received February 12, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5324. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — International Nuclear and Radiological Event Scale (INES) Participation MD 5.12 received February 12, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5325. A letter from the Program Manager, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Summary of Benefits and Coverage and Uniform Glossary — Templates, Instructions, and Related Materials; and Guidance for Compliance [CMS-9982-FN] received February 14, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5326. A letter from the Assistant Secretary For Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment to Existing Validated End-User Authorizations for Applied Materials (China), Inc., Boeing Tianjin Composites Co. Ltd., CSMC Technologies Corporation, Lam Research Corporation, and Semiconductor Manufacturing International Corporation in the People's Republic of China, and for GE India Industrial Pvt. Ltd. In India [Docket No.: 110525297-1476-01] (RIN: 0694-AF26) received February 13, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5327. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Updated Statements of Legal Authority To Reflect Continuation of Emergency Declared in Executive Orders 12947 and 13224 [Docket No.: 120124063-0261-01] (RIN: 0694-AF55) received February 12, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5328. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's report on progress toward a negotiated solution of the Cyprus question covering the period October 1, 2011 through November 30, 2011; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5329. A letter from the Assistant Director for Policy, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Iranian Financial Sanctions Regulations received February 13, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5330. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Administration and Management, Department of Labor, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5331. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Administration and Management, Department of Labor, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5332. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Administration and Management, Department of Labor, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5333. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Administration and Management, Department of Labor, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform

Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5334. A letter from the Inspector General, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting fiscal year 2013 Congressional Justification of Budget for the Office of the Inspector General; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5335. A letter from the Acting Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Marine Mammals; Subsistence Taking of Northern Fur Seals; Harvest Estimates [Docket No.: 110781394-2048-02] (RIN: 0648-BB09) received February 12, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5336. A letter from the Chief, Branch of Listing, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Endangered Status and Designations of Critical Habitat for Spikedace and Loach Minnow [Docket No.: FWS-R2-ES-2010-0072] (RIN: 1018-AX17) received February 17, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5337. A letter from the Acting Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the 2012 biennial report on the "Deep Sea Coral Research and Technology Program"; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5338. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Coastal Migratory Pelagic Resources of the Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic; Trip Limit Increase [Docket No.: 001005281-0369-02] (RIN: 0648-XA974) received February 12, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5339. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's determination on a petition on behalf of workers from the Savannah River Site in Aiken, South Carolina, to be added to the Special Exposure Cohort (SEC), pursuant to the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program Act of 2000 (EEOICPA); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5340. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Employment and Training, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's "Major" final rule — Temporary Non-Agricultural Employment of H-2B Aliens in the United States (RIN: 1205-AB58) received February 17, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5341. A letter from the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting a report on the proposed fiscal year 2013 budget; jointly to the Committees on Agriculture and Oversight and Government Reform.

5342. A letter from the Board Members, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting Congressional Justification of Budget Estimates for Fiscal Year 2013, including the Performance Plan, pursuant to 45 U.S.C. 231f(f); jointly to the Committees on Appropriations, Transportation and Infrastructure, and Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. NUGENT: Committee on Rules. H. Res. 591. A resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5) to improve patient access to health care services and provide improved medical care by reducing the excessive burden the liability system places on the health care delivery system (Rept. 112-416). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BACHUS: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 4014. A bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act with respect to information provided to the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection (Rept. 112-417). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. CAMPBELL (for himself and Mr. DeFAZIO):

H.R. 4214. A bill to amend the Toxic Substances Control Act to prohibit the use, production, sale, importation, or exportation of the poison sodium fluoroacetate (known as "Compound 1080") and to prohibit the use of sodium cyanide for predator control; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. McMorris Rodgers:

H.R. 4215. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for pharmacy benefits manager standards under the Medicare prescription drug program to further fair audits of and payments to pharmacies; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. POE of Texas (for himself and Mr. CHABOT):

H.R. 4216. A bill to provide for the exchange of information related to trade enforcement; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRIMM (for himself and Mr. KING of New York):

H.R. 4217. A bill to support and promote community financial institutions in the mutual form, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H.R. 4218. A bill to preserve affordable housing opportunities for low-income families, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H.R. 4219. A bill to amend section 1451 of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act to establish programs to provide counseling to homebuyers regarding voluntary home inspections and to train counselors to provide such counseling, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H.R. 4220. A bill to establish a pilot program to train public housing residents as home health aides and in home-based health services to enable such residents to provide covered home-based health services to residents of public housing and residents of federally-assisted rental housing, who are elderly and disabled, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. RUSH):

H.R. 4221. A bill to create jobs in the United States by increasing United States exports to Africa by at least 200 percent in real dollar value within 10 years, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, Ways and Means, and Small Business, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GRIJALVA:

H.R. 4222. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain land inholdings owned by the United States to the Tucson Unified School District and to the Pascua Yaqui Tribe of Arizona, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER (for himself, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. COBLE, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. PIERLUISI, and Mr. MEEHAN):

H.R. 4223. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit theft of medical products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN of Georgia:

H.R. 4224. A bill to repeal the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the percentage floor on medical expense deductions, expand the use of tax-preferred health care accounts, and establish a charity care credit, to amend the Social Security Act to create a Medicare Premium Assistance Program and reform EMTALA requirements, and to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for cooperative governing of individual and group health insurance coverage offered in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Education and the Workforce, the Judiciary, Natural Resources, Rules, Appropriations, and House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HOLT (for himself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HONDA, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. POLIS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Ms. SLAUGHTER):

H.R. 4225. A bill to amend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act to require local educational agencies and schools to implement integrated pest management programs to minimize the use of pesticides in schools and to provide parents, guardians, and employees with notice of the use of pesticides in schools, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Ms. MOORE:

H.R. 4226. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the full exclusion applicable to qualified small business stock; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TIERNEY (for himself, Mr. HINOJOSA, and Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California):

H.R. 4227. A bill to reauthorize the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 to strengthen the United States workforce investment system through innovation in, and alignment and improvement of, employment, training, and education programs, and to promote national economic growth, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. ROYCE):

H. Con. Res. 109. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the People's Republic of China should not repatriate the North Korean refugees detained in China, subjecting them to torture, imprisonment, and execution, but allow their resettlement in the Republic of Korea and other countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. LEE of California (for herself, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. NADLER, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. MOORE, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. NOR-TON, Mr. STARK, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. FILNER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Mr. RAHALL, and Mrs. DAVIS of California):

H. Res. 589. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of Professional Social Work Month and World Social Work Day; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut:

H. Res. 590. A resolution electing Members to certain standing committees of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to, considered and agreed to.

By Ms. HAHN (for herself, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. SABLAN, Ms. MOORE, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. BOUTSTANY, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. STARK, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SIRE, Mr. SCALISE, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. CLARKE of Michigan, and Mr. FILNER):

H. Res. 592. A resolution recognizing the importance of ports to the economy and national security of the United States; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. CAMPBELL:

H.R. 4214.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS:

H.R. 4215.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, clause 3 to regulate Commerce among the several States.

By Mr. POE of Texas:

H.R. 4216.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 8 of section 8 of Article I of the Constitution

By Mr. GRIMM:

H.R. 4217.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H.R. 4218.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to . . . provide for the . . . general Welfare of the United States; . . .

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H.R. 4219.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to . . . provide for the . . . general Welfare of the United States; . . .

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H.R. 4220.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to . . . provide for the . . . general Welfare of the United States; . . .

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 4221.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. GRIJALVA:

H.R. 4222.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 4223.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The authority to enact this bill is derived from, but may not be limited to, Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BROWN of Georgia:

H.R. 4224.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 [the Spending Clause] of the United States Constitution states that 'The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay for Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States.' This bill restores the proper balance of power between the federal and state governments as intended under the 10th Amendment to the Constitution by devolving the responsibilities related to health care to the states and individuals.

It reinforces the founding constitutional principle that state governments and individuals are properly situated with attending to their own health, safety, and general welfare.

By Mr. HOLT:

H.R. 4225.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Ms. MOORE:

H.R. 4226.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1: The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. TIERNEY:

H.R. 4227.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 111: Mr. CLAY.
H.R. 374: Mr. GARDNER and Mr. OLSON.
H.R. 376: Mr. WALZ of Minnesota.
H.R. 469: Mr. TIERNEY.
H.R. 607: Mr. RUNYAN.
H.R. 632: Mr. HENSARLING.
H.R. 735: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.
H.R. 749: Mr. PAULSEN and Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.
H.R. 780: Mr. LOEBSACK and Mr. MARKEY.
H.R. 834: Ms. BONAMICI.
H.R. 854: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
H.R. 941: Mr. KISSELL, Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS, and Mr. MATHESON.
H.R. 972: Mr. LONG.
H.R. 1080: Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS.
H.R. 1164: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania and Mr. BERG.
H.R. 1172: Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 1244: Mr. LONG.
H.R. 1288: Mr. PAUL, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. LOEBSACK, and Mr. CARNEY.
H.R. 1316: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 1332: Ms. HAHN, Mr. HONDA, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. SIRES, and Mr. PETERS.
H.R. 1381: Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. HONDA, and Mrs. MALONEY.
H.R. 1391: Mr. LIPINSKI and Mr. KISSELL.
H.R. 1412: Mr. MARCHANT.
H.R. 1445: Mr. MCCOTTER.
H.R. 1451: Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 1488: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 1533: Mr. VISCLOSKEY.
H.R. 1549: Mr. LUETKEMEYER.
H.R. 1575: Mr. TOWNS.
H.R. 1639: Mr. MARINO.
H.R. 1675: Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. JONES, and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 1700: Mr. BROOKS.
H.R. 1780: Mrs. CAPPs.
H.R. 1792: Mr. ISRAEL.
H.R. 1842: Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. BONAMICI, and Ms. DELAURIO.
H.R. 1860: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
H.R. 1876: Mr. CLEAVER.
H.R. 1909: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.
H.R. 1955: Mr. DEGETTE, Mr. GUTIERREZ, and Mr. SIRES.
H.R. 2003: Ms. BONAMICI.
H.R. 2051: Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. KLINE, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. PETERS, Mr. PAULSEN, and Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina.
H.R. 2086: Mr. BACA, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Ms. MOORE.
H.R. 2119: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 2288: Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 2406: Mr. DENHAM.
H.R. 2479: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. RANGEL, and Ms. BONAMICI.
H.R. 2517: Mrs. DAVIS of California.
H.R. 2541: Mr. BONNER and Mr. TIPTON.
H.R. 2547: Mr. TIERNEY.
H.R. 2569: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.
H.R. 2595: Mr. STARK.
H.R. 2695: Mr. STIVERS.
H.R. 2827: Mr. ROSS of Arkansas.
H.R. 2926: Mr. LAMBORN.
H.R. 2959: Ms. JENKINS.
H.R. 3000: Mr. CULBERSON.
H.R. 3048: Mr. JONES.
H.R. 3057: Mr. GUTIERREZ and Mr. FILNER.
H.R. 3061: Mr. WEST and Mrs. ADAMS.
H.R. 3125: Mr. BERMAN and Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 3145: Ms. MOORE, Mr. BOSWELL, and Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 3164: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia and Mr. POSEY.
H.R. 3187: Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. MORAN, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. STARK, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Mr. REICHERT.
H.R. 3202: Mr. BISHOP of New York.
H.R. 3264: Mr. GINGREY of Georgia.
H.R. 3364: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. ROSS of Arkansas, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. WALDEN, and Mr. PALLONE.
H.R. 3418: Ms. BASS of California.
H.R. 3423: Mr. SCHOCK, Ms. HAYWORTH, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. SCHILLING, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. HOLDEN, Ms. BUEKLE, Mr. PETERS, Mrs. NOEM, and Ms. BONAMICI.
H.R. 3425: Ms. HAHN.
H.R. 3461: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. BERG, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Ms. BERKLEY, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. GOSAR, and Mr. CUELLAR.
H.R. 3485: Mr. HIMES.
H.R. 3491: Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 3596: Mr. MCINTYRE and Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 3612: Ms. CLARKE of New York and Mr. ISRAEL.
H.R. 3625: Ms. BASS of California and Mrs. MALONEY.

H.R. 3633: Mr. CULBERSON.
H.R. 3661: Mr. McDERMOTT.
H.R. 3670: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
H.R. 3687: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 3692: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 3728: Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan and Mr. SHIMKUS.
H.R. 3767: Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina and Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 3770: Mr. FLORES.
H.R. 3858: Ms. PINGREE of Maine.
H.R. 3875: Mr. CONYERS and Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 3895: Mr. KISSELL, Mr. TURNER of New York, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
H.R. 3981: Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. KISSELL, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, and Mr. BROUN of Georgia.
H.R. 3991: Mr. QUAYLE and Mr. GOWDY.
H.R. 3993: Mr. BACA.
H.R. 4010: Mr. TIERNEY.
H.R. 4030: Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 4045: Mr. JONES, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. TURNER of Ohio, and Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 4046: Mr. LANKFORD.
H.R. 4049: Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 4060: Mr. LAMBORN.
H.R. 4077: Mr. WALBERG.
H.R. 4083: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
H.R. 4125: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
H.R. 4128: Mr. MANZULLO and Mr. CRAVAACK.
H.R. 4134: Mr. KIND.
H.R. 4136: Mr. LANDRY and Mr. LONG.
H.R. 4171: Mr. PAUL.
H.R. 4174: Mr. MCHENRY.
H.R. 4176: Mr. WHITFIELD and Mr. PETERS.
H.R. 4185: Mr. KEATING.
H.R. 4196: Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. LEVIN, and Mr. OLSON.
H.R. 4202: Mr. DOGGETT.
H.R. 4203: Mr. PETERS, Mr. CRITZ, and Mr. CICILLINE.
H.J. Res. 103: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska and Mr. LAMBORN.
H.J. Res. 104: Mr. GUINTA.
H. Con. Res. 87: Mr. LATTI and Mr. TOWNS.
H. Res. 16: Mr. HULTGREN.
H. Res. 25: Mr. LOEBSACK.
H. Res. 111: Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. WHITFIELD, and Mr. MCCOTTER.
H. Res. 134: Mr. BUCHANAN.
H. Res. 282: Mr. ROYCE, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. FILNER, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, and Ms. SPEIER.
H. Res. 509: Mr. FLORES.
H. Res. 526: Mr. KLINE.
H. Res. 560: Mr. POLIS.
H. Res. 561: Mr. POSEY.
H. Res. 564: Mr. MARKEY and Ms. CHU.
H. Res. 583: Mr. McDERMOTT, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Mr. PITTS, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. LANCE, Mr. STARK, Mr. DeFAZIO, Mr. DEUTCH, and Mr. GARAMENDI.